BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE LEFT

Volume II

by

FRANCIS X. GANNON

$9.00

BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY OF THE LEFT

There is a Left in America. That is a fact of life. To deny it is to deny the existence of a far-flung establishment whose members have been working tirelessly for decades to Socialize or – if you please – Sovietize the United States.

To determine why any particular individual would have become a leftist is not the purpose of this study. He may have arrived on the Left, motivated by genuine idealism, incurable do-goodism, scholarly curiosity, compassionate brotherhood, or by nothing more harmless than a search for adventure. The motives may have been of a crasser nature; financial, political, or social opportunism; dedication to Socialism or Communism or some variance of these alien totalitarian systems.

What does matter for this report is that the individual has been and is on the Left, working for leftist causes – domestic and foreign – and his activities can be recognized.

The causes of the American leftist on the domestic scene have been directed toward the exaltation of society and the state by attacks upon individual and family dignity and property rights. The leftist has promoted confiscatory taxation, deficit spending, deliberate inflation, and wilful debauchery of the entire monetary system. Fraudulent and compulsory insurance schemes have been presented as social security; federal control and dominance of education as aid; dictatorial ukases as judicial decisions.

(continued on back flap)

Biographical Dictionary Of The Left

Copyright ©1971 by Western Islands

All Rights Reserved

The text of this publication or any part thereof may not be reproduced in any manner whatsoever without permission in writing from the publisher.

Published by
Western Islands
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

Manufactured in the United States of America

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword By The Publisher vii

Introduction ix

Organizations Of The Left 1

Biographical Dictionary Of The Left 203

Index Of Organizations 597

Index Of Biographies 601

A FOREWORD BY THE PUBLISHER

It is our present expectation that this *Biographical Dictionary Of The Left* will consist of eight volumes in this Western Islands edition, and will contain in all about twenty-five hundred names. As an aid to the reader and as an important preface to the biographies included, each volume will begin with a section on organizations of the Left.

Because of the urgent need for such a reference dictionary, we shall bring out each compilation of about three hundred sketches as soon as it is ready, in the same format as this volume. All of the names in any one volume will be alphabetized into one sequence between its covers. This will require extra work by the reader, in searching for a particular entry. But it is far more practicable, and will make the early volumes far more useful, than if we followed the alternative procedure – as did the French *Encyclopédists,* for instance – of having each volume simply move further down the total alphabet. As an aid to the reader, we have included in Volume Two a cumulative index of the organizations and individuals covered in both of the first two volumes.

Each volume is being prepared by, or under the careful supervision of, Dr. Francis X. Gannon, head of the Research Department of The John Birch Society. Dr. Gannon, who received his Ph.D. in History from Georgetown University, has long been a worthy disciple of his great teacher, the eminent historian Charles Callan Tansill. Sound scholarship in his chosen field, and unimpeachable accuracy in every line he writes, have been imperative considerations for Dr. Gannon, as they were for Dr. Tansill before him.

Believing that it is better to err a hundred times on the side of restraint and understatement than to err even once, no matter how slightly, on the side of abuse or exaggeration, Dr. Gannon will give you in these volumes as much dependable information concerning contemporary leaders of the liberal-left persuasion as space, time, and other practical limitations will permit. And we send this second volume forth in continuance of the tremendous project which we hope will result in a series of reference books which will prove useful to all patriotic students of the planned and subversive confusion which now engulfs us all.

Editorial Staff, Western Islands

INTRODUCTION

There is a Left in America. That is a fact of life. To deny it is to deny the existence of a far-flung establishment whose members have been working tirelessly for decades to Socialize or – if you please – Sovietize the United States.

To determine why any particular individual may have become a leftist is not the purpose of this study. He may have arrived on the Left motivated by genuine idealism, incurable do-goodism, scholarly curiosity, compassionate brotherhood, or by a sentiment no more harmful than desire for adventure. Or his motives may have been of a crasser nature: financial, political, or social opportunism; dedication to Socialism or Communism or some variant of these alien totalitarian systems.

What does matter for this report is that the individual has been and is on the Left, working for leftist causes. A pattern of his past and present positions, his media and affiliations, his causes – domestic and foreign – and his activities can be recognized.

The leftist has come from Ivy League, state, and sectarian universities and colleges. He has received Rhodes and Fulbright scholarships; Guggenheim and Nieman fellowships; Carnegie and Ford and 20th Century Fund grants; Pulitzer and Nobel prizes; Sidney Hillman and Freedom House awards; and sinecures at foundations or university and government research centers. He has had his plays or books reviewed favorably in the *New York Times,* the *New Republic, Time,* and the *Nation.* He has studied abroad at the London School of Economics or at Oxford or graduate schools in New Delhi or Geneva. He has joined the NAACP, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Union for Democratic Action – later Americans for Democratic Action – or one or many Communist fronts.

The leftist has been in government offices on federal, state, and local levels – through election or appointment, or in consultative or advisory capacities; in radio and television, in commercial and educational films, on newspapers and magazines, on trade organs and scholarly journals – as commentator, editor, producer, director, publisher, writer, cartoonist, reviewer; in religion – all creeds – preaching, writing, and politicking; on university and college campuses – as teacher, administrator, researcher, scholar-in-residence, and student activist; in organized labor; in business and trade associations; in the recently developed "think" factories, which are government-financed research projects involving the most critical problems of diplomacy, economics, military strategy, and national security; and in the arts – as illustrator, painter, sculptor, playwright, novelist, poet, and entertainer.

After Franklin Roosevelt inaugurated the New Deal, the leftist was to be found in the higher echelons of Henry Wallace's Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department of Henry Morgenthau and Harry Dexter White, the National Labor Relations Board, the Office of Education, the State Department, and Frances Perkins' Department of Labor. Some leftists even moved into the White House, and others wormed their way onto congressional committee staffs.

In the circumstances immediately surrounding World War II, the leftist sought his niche in the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Strategic Services, the Office of War Information, the War Production Board, and the Board of Economic Warfare. Later, the leftist was to be found in the Central Intelligence Agency; on the United Nations staff; in the foreign aid programs (under their ever-changing names); in the Alliance for Progress, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Peace Corps, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Look for the leftist in the AFL-CIO, on the Supreme Court, in the Foreign Policy Association, in the American Assembly, in the National Council of Churches, at the New School for Social Research, in the Brookings Institute, in Chambers of Commerce, in gubernatorial mansions, on Wall Street, in Congress, in the Anti-Defamation League, in the Institute for American Democracy, in mental health associations, in American Friends of Vietnam, in the Republican and Democrat parties, and marching side-by-side with black powerites, trampling upon others' civil rights and violating law and order.

The causes of the American leftist on the domestic scene have been directed toward the exaltation of society and the state by attacks upon individual and family dignity and property rights. The leftist has promoted confiscatory taxation, deficit spending, deliberate inflation, and wilful debauchery of the entire monetary system. Fraudulent and compulsory insurance schemes have been presented as social security; federal control and dominance of education as aid; dictatorial ukases as judicial decisions.

The leftist has preached that Joe McCarthy had to go – Alger Hiss was framed – Owen Lattimore was an objective scholar – Jomo Kenyatta is a statesman – Titoism is a gentle kind of Communism – Castro and Sukarno and Ben Bella were George Washington reincarnated – the United Nations is mankind's best and last hope – *extreme* leftists and extreme rightists are equally dangerous – the U.S. Constitution was written for horse and buggy days – the Communists have mellowed – loyalty oaths attack academic freedom – better-Red-than-dead – congressional committees are inquisitorial except when presided over by Fulbright or Celler or Symington – and the Third World War (a nuclear holocaust) is just around the corner unless the military-industrial complex can be ground to bits in a Pentagon computer.

In the State Department and elsewhere, the leftist has not turned his back on Alger Hiss, and the Department's leftward foreign policy has been the work of Dean Acheson's protégés, George Kennan's disciples, and the Institute of Pacific Relations veterans led by Dean Rusk. Derogated as fantasies are Communist aggression and Communist subversion. Business as usual with Communist enemies is encouraged in time of hot war, which the leftist calls cold. Red China should be extended formal diplomatic recognition and brought into the "peace-loving" United Nations. The leftist wants nuclear treaties and disarmament; dialogues with the Communists; a United Nations "peacekeeping" force; and, most of all, Peaceful Coexistence with the Communist tyrants who are irrevocably bent on world conquest.

The leftist is not necessarily – though he may be – scribbling the latest party line in the pages of *The Worker* or grinding out revolutionary tracts in a dank cellar or dusty loft. The Left is far more inclusive than a hard-core of disciplined members of the Communist Party. There are legions of leftists who have gravitated – not merely through coincidence – toward common bases of activity. The leftist is here in America in greater numbers, more secure in his influence, and accelerating his program faster, than ever before. He may deny that he is part of any establishment but his denials will be more heated if he is accused of "rightism." In the following biographical sketches, we present the leftist in his environment.

FRANCIS X. GANNON
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

NOTE TO THE READER

Phrases contained in quotation marks, characterizing various organizations and publications, are quoted from *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications,* prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the U.S. House of Representatives, December 1, 1961. The reports in this publication are in turn verbatim quotations from reports of Federal government and Congressional authorities, namely, the committee itself (HCUA), the Senate Judiciary Committee and its Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Subversive Activities Control Board; and from letters to the Loyalty Review Board from United States Attorneys General Francis Biddle, Tom Clark, and J. Howard McGrath; and also from reports of State or (then) territorial investigating committees (California, Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, Ohio).

It should be noted that no revision of this guide, first published in 1957, has been issued since 1961.

Organizations Of The Left

THE ADVERTISING COUNCIL

Atop the first page of the three-page advertisement were these words: "Publisher's Note – This is an advertisement, but one of such unusual character we are glad to be a sponsor of it." The advertisement, which appeared without cost in many national magazines in December 1958, had the format of an article, with the title: "Persuaders in the Public Interest," and subtitle: "The story of a little-known band of men and women who created a Hundred Million Dollar Non-Profit Trust that works for the public good."

The pseudonymous author of the advertisement-article wrote: "You've probably never heard of The Advertising Council, but it is unlikely that a day passes in which you are not exposed to the persuasive messages, prepared and disseminated under its auspices, on the air or in print. This is a good thing for you, and for your country.

"It all started when an advertising man had lunch with a Princeton professor and three officers of the Rockefeller Foundation in New York. This was in the spring of 1941 . . . .

"He [the advertising man] said all foundations were making two mistakes in policy. First, they spent most of their money on the *increase* of knowledge and very little on the distribution of it. Second, when they did spend money on the distribution of knowledge, they used old-fashioned horse-and-buggy methods, and ignored the modern high-speed effectiveness of motion pictures, broadcasting, and advertising . . . .

"His convictions, widely shared by many advertising men at that time, boiled down to this: (1) American advertising facilities and techniques had become the most effective means for the communication of new knowledge, and for persuasion to use it, which the world had ever seen. (2) This means of communication could be used just as effectively in the public interest as it was being used in the private interest. (3) Advertising being a communication facility developed by business, business itself might well consider making it available for public welfare projects and organizations.

"Out of these convictions The Advertising Council was born in November, 1941. Its initial organizers and financial supporters were the six official organizations of national advertisers, of magazine, newspaper, radio, and outdoor media owners, and of advertising agencies."

During World War II, the organization – non-profit and tax-exempt – became the War Advertising Council. Advertising agencies prepared governmental messages, which were carried without cost in publications, on radio, and on outdoor advertising posters. The messages promoted salvage projects, the sale of war bonds, rationing programs, victory gardens, and the recruitment of merchant mariners, WACS, WAVES, and nurses. By war's end, a billion dollars' worth of governmental messages had been processed and published through the facilities of the War Advertising Council.

According to the 1958 advertisement-article: "When the war ended, many in the War Advertising Council thought its usefulness was over. There were more who felt that the instrument of public information, which the Council had created, was far too valuable to be reserved for war. The government still had jobs of public information which needed doing . . . . The word 'War' was dropped from the name, and The Advertising Council continued. But here it faced a new problem." In fact, the problem was two-headed: What non-governmental and governmental projects should be supported? Who would determine which projects were in the public interest?

The problem was solved by having The Advertising Council's board of directors screen proposed projects and determine whether or not the projects could benefit from national advertising. Then, a Public Policy Committee, a group of 20 individuals selected by the board of directors, would vote on whether or not a particular project was "importantly in the public interest."

Dan Smoot, in his remarkable volume, *The Invisible Government,* has observed: " . . . Many advertisers and broadcasting officials . . . are badgered to support countless causes and campaigns, most of which sound good but some of which may be objectionable. Investigating to screen the good from the bad is a major job. The Advertising Council does this job. The Council is respected by industry, by the public, and by government. It is safe to promote a project which the Advertising Council claims to be 'importantly in the public interest.' Thus, officials of the Advertising Council have become czars in a most important field. They arbitrarily decide what is, and what is not, in the public interest. When the Advertising Council 'accepts' a project, the most proficient experts in the world – leading Madison Avenue people – go to work, without charge, to create (and saturate the media of mass communication with) the skillful propaganda that 'sells' the project to the public."

Mr. Smoot also made the important observation "that the Advertising Council is responsible to no one. If a business firm should decide on its own to include some 'public service' project in its advertising, and the project evoked public indignation, the business firm would lose customers. The Advertising Council has no customers to please. Yet, the Advertising Council is a private agency, beyond the reach of voter and taxpayer indignation which, theoretically, can exercise some control over public agencies."

The best known of The Advertising Council's projects has been the Smokey-the-Bear program to prevent forest fires. Other projects have been in support of the American Red Cross, the United Fund, the American Council to Improve Our Neighborhoods, U.S. Savings Bonds, church and synagogue attendance, public schools, traffic safety, Radio Free Europe, the National Association of Mental Health, medical research programs, get-out-the-vote campaigns, financial aid for higher education, and Law Day ("World Peace Through World Law").

One of the most ambitious programs undertaken by The Advertising Council centered upon a booklet, *Challenge to Americans.* The story was told in The Advertising Council's annual report for 1962-1963: "Perhaps our own generation can be wiser in meeting the grave challenges which can destroy the American way of life as we have known it, if we can expand our awareness of the new and great forces moving in our ever-shrinking world.

"With this thought in mind, the Council's Directors and staff began exploratory conversations early in 1961 with members of its Public Policy Committee and Industries Advisory Committee; with historians, scientists and educators; and with officials and experts of the Federal Government. The talks continued without interruption during the transition from the Eisenhower to the Kennedy Administration . . . .

"Three questions dominated the talks: What are the greatest challenges to our civilization? What must Americans do to face these challenges and win? How can advertising help induce more Americans to do their part?

"It was decided that the major challenges to Americans were five: (1) The challenge of the awakening peoples. (2) The scientific and technological challenges. (3) The challenge of international cooperation. (4) The communist challenge. (5) The challenge of our own permanent revolution.

"An illustrated booklet, *Challenge to Americans,* was written about these challenges. It was approved by the Department of State and by various Council bodies, and both President John F. Kennedy and General Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote forewords for it. Advertisements for all major media were presented, offering free copies of the booklet.

"The campaign was launched in late 1962 with eleven of the largest mass circulation magazines and twelve national business publications running a double-page advertisement in contributed space. Almost one hundred daily newspapers gave space for 1000-line advertisements. Radio and television networks made wide use of materials furnished by the Council. And company publications gave more than one hundred pages for a special house magazine advertisement.

"By June 30, 1963, a quarter million copies of the booklet had been requested and mailed. Current individual requests for it average 1300 daily. Companies and organizations are ordering bulk quantities for distribution."

The booklet, *Challenge to Americans,* carried the notation that the text had been approved by the Department of State. The notice was really unnecessary. From beginning to end, the text reflected the leftist-internationalist policy that has been the hallmark of United States diplomacy for the better part of the past four decades.

The first chapter of the booklet ("The Challenge of the Awakening Peoples") read as if it were a routine press release from the State Department. The "awakening peoples," their lives having been stirred by the tides of change, were to be found "not only in the newly independent nations but also in ancient undeveloped lands and even in highly advanced countries. They cry out for progress, opportunity, and a voice in world affairs." Answering their cry is "the United States, through AID (Agency for International Development) programs, the Alliance for Progress, cultural exchanges, the Peace Corps, Food for Peace, expansion of trade, stimulation of private investment, and a variety of other constructive activities."

As justification for the U.S. handouts to the "awakening peoples," *Challenge to Americans* cited Communism, which "has mobilized its arsenal of political, economic, psychological, para-military and other subversive weapons to penetrate the awakening nations in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Communists seek to win them over where possible, to alienate them from the United States and its allies, and to soften them up for eventual conquest by direct or indirect aggression."

Then, in two disingenuous passages, The Advertising Council explained: First, "Direct aggression has become dangerous for the Communists because of the collective security systems fashioned by the United States and its allies. Balked here, communism has turned to the tactic of intensified indirect aggression. Guerrilla warfare and the other arts of subversion are practiced on the pretense of supporting so-called 'wars of national liberation.' " [Of course, no example was cited of the Communists' having been balked in direct aggression by the United States and any combination of its allies. Omitted also was the fact that Communist subversion was directed as much against the United States as against the "awakening peoples." This latter omission was explained by President Theodore S. Repplier of The Advertising Council when, in 1961, he wrote that he and his associates were contemplating a program "to give Americans a better understanding of Communism and its methods." Said Repplier, the program "will deal with Communism and its activities overseas rather than Communist subversion in the United States. The difficulty with the latter, of course, as you know, is that some people in their zeal are inclined to start throwing accusations around pretty loosely. Our feeling is that the detection of Communism in the United States is best left to the FBI."] The second passage read: "The United States is meeting this threat [of intensified indirect aggression] by rapidly strengthening its own defenses, particularly its conventional military capabilities and anti-guerrilla forces. It is also helping countries which are particular targets for intensified Communist indirect aggression, such as South Vietnam, to strengthen their internal defenses. Although our programs of economic assistance were not devised primarily because of the Communist menace they, too, add greatly to the new nations' powers of resistance and prospects of stable growth." [There was no mention that the United States was working feverishly for disarmament while the Communists were trying to develop their "unconventional" military capabilities. There was no mention that not only were "our programs of economic assistance . . . not devised primarily because of the Communist menace," but also the same programs of economic assistance were extended to Communist regimes and regimes extremely sympathetic to Communism.]

For individual Americans, The Advertising Council had advice as to how to answer the challenge of the awakening peoples: join the Peace Corps; participate in people-to-people programs; when traveling abroad, respect the local customs; join a world affairs discussion group, using background material of the Foreign Policy Association [which reflects the most insidious leftist policies of the Department of State]; and study a foreign language.

In chapter two ("The Scientific and Technological Challenge"), there was the usual leftist obeisance to Soviet achievements in science and technology – the sort of achievements claimed but seldom proven. It was also said: "The Soviets have exploited their successes in space as a means of gaining national prestige, impressing the new nations with their progress and trying to intimidate the world at large with the military implications of their rocket capabilities." [Unmentioned were the hordes of Americans, in the news media, in governmental and private scientific and technological sectors, and in diplomatic circles, who seemed hell-bent on exploiting Soviet space successes when confronted by the flimsiest evidence that such successes were real.]

Chapter three ("The Challenge of International Cooperation") was mainly a plea to support the United Nations: "Since the Second World War there has been a rebirth of hope in the effort to advance the cause of peace, law, and progress among nations. The greatest advances have come through world cooperation in international organizations founded on the principles of free societies. Paramount among the world bodies is the United Nations . . . . The UN Charter is founded on principles that parallel those of our own Constitution. The aims of the organization and its specialized agencies are akin to our own. In its sixteen years of busy life, the UN has become a world influence for order and justice. It has won the special support of the new and weaker nations which need its protection and aid the most. Not the least proof of the UN's effectiveness is that it has become a main target of Soviet vituperation." – "The Communist bloc has watched with mounting apprehension the steady growth in stature, experience and effectiveness of the UN . . . . " [Of course, unmentioned in the tribute to the United Nations were the historical facts that, in the lifetime of the UN, the Communists tightened their grip on the captive nations in eastern Europe and in the Baltic region, took over Cambodia, mainland China, Cuba, North Korea, Tibet, and North Vietnam, and subverted a number of African, Asian, and Latin American nations; and India overwhelmed Goa.] For individual Americans who wished to further "international cooperation," The Advertising Council urged observance of United Nations

Day, visits to United Nations headquarters and the Foreign Policy Association's World Affairs Center, attendance at briefings on the United Nations given at the U.S. Mission to the UN, and support of the U.S. Committee for the United Nations.

In chapter four ("The Communist Challenge"), there was a realistic evaluation of Communism, which was said to be seeking "to take control of the entire globe by threat, deceit, subversion and aggression, direct and indirect attack." – "It would be foolhardy to underestimate the danger of the Communist threat." – "It is therefore imperative for us to 'know the enemy,' study his history, his ideology, his aims and methods." – "Study of the Communist movement is important, but it alone is not enough to meet the challenge. As responsible and dedicated citizens we must each take part in constructive activities that will strengthen our community, our Nation, our friends in the free world. We are each *personally* involved. All we cherish, the human values of our civilization – our very lives – are threatened with destruction." To avoid the destruction, The Advertising Council advised individuals to study Communism, support Radio Free Europe, and "rely on the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the appropriate agency to investigate possible subversive activities within the U.S. Discourage self-appointed vigilante groups from attempting to perform such delicate functions." [As is the liberals' habitual wont, The Advertising Council failed to mention the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and state legislative investigative committees in their role of investigating subversion. Nor was there any encouragement for individuals to apply pressure upon the Department of Justice to prosecute subversives uncovered by the FBI.]

The fifth chapter ("The Challenge of Our Own Permanent Revolution") brimmed over with platitudinous breast-beating: "We live in a period of swift change" – "we face new and terribly perplexing economic problems" – "we need more purposeful lives" – "we often feel overwhelmed by the mass and complexity of domestic and international problems" – "we cannot rest on our laurels." To continue "our own permanent revolution," we should support the President's Council on Youth Fitness, join PTA groups, participate in the "You Are Challenged" program of The American Assembly, buy U.S. Savings Bonds, and work for better schools and housing, employment opportunities, and civil rights.

In the summer of 1963, while the *Challenge to Americans* booklet program was still going strong, The Advertising Council began a massive campaign to promote the United Nations. The Council's president, Theodore S. Repplier, explained: "Since Congress has wholeheartedly continued to support United States participation in the United Nations, the Council can only assume that it is the will of the majority of the people of this country to see the United Nations become as effective as possible . . . . We realize, of course, that the United Nations has many drawbacks and is far from perfect. Along with the Congress, however, we feel that an imperfect instrument to preserve peace is better than no instrument at all."

Two officials of The Advertising Council, Robert Benjamin, chairman of the U.S. Committee for the UN, and Samuel Thurm, vice president of Lever Brothers, issued a statement: "It is a time of action for those of us who believe the United Nations must prevail. We must build *support for the UN* among the people of this country . . . . Now is the most critical stage in the development of this advertising. We must get it *exposed* to as many Americans as possible, as often as possible."

The printed advertisements for the UN campaign, which appeared in newspapers and magazines, featured a photograph of a mushroom cloud, similar to the effects of a nuclear bomb explosion. The accompanying caption was utterly tasteless: "This is one alternative to the United Nations." Then followed a text that included the stock clichés, apologies, and mythical achievements that UN fanatics repeat in their propaganda: "The U.N. is not perfect but it is our one best hope." – "In the Cuban crisis, the U.N. provided the means and the place to confront the Russians before the world." – "In the Congo, the U.N. helped restore order . . . . " – "The U.N. gets at the roots of war." – " . . . History proves that the Soviet Union cannot dominate the United Nations." – "The U.N. provides a forum for governments to 'blow off steam.' Far better to pound a shoe than to unleash a rocket. World leaders are 'onstage' before the conscience of world opinion." – "The United Nations has far to go but when we mock its weaknesses, we mock ourselves." – "The U.N. needs the moral support of every American, not out of fear alone, but out of understanding."

By the mid-1960's the pro-United Nations bias of The Advertising Council almost overshadowed its bias for New Frontier and Great Society projects. This situation was understandable in view of the personnel who guided the Council's Public Policy Committee, including such left-of-center individuals as Ralph Bunche of the United Nations, labor leader Joseph A. Beirne, Paul Hoffman of the United Nations Special Fund, pollster Elmo Roper, President John Dickey of Dartmouth College, President Henry Wriston of The American Assembly, columnist Roscoe Drummond, President Sarah G. Blanding of Vassar College, President Thomas J. Watson Jr. of IBM, and Eugene Meyer of the *Washington Post.*

From 1946 until 1966, the presidency of The Advertising Council was held by Theodore S. Repplier, who had prior experience of more than twenty years in the advertising business. Repplier's ideological position was probably never more clearly revealed than in a speech delivered to a Magazine Publishers Association conference in 1966. He spoke of five forces which make it *inevitable* that government will increasingly invade our lives. In connection with the atomic bomb as a factor, Repplier raised the specter of a nuclear holocaust: "Never before in history have three or four men on this planet had the power to destroy half the world's people by pushing a button." As another factor, he identified the scientific revolution: "Automation alone has thus far been responsible for a whole series of manpower laws. More government – and the end is not yet."

The "population explosion" was also a factor cited by Repplier. As was the case with automation, he predicted and voiced no objection to the growth of governmental interference: "America is headed for standing room only. And the more crowded an area becomes, the more need for regulations, ordinances, law and thou-shalt-nots. Our pioneer ancestors had few regulations, nor needed many. Our descendants will have more than we have." The same willingness to accept perpetually growing statism was present when Repplier talked of the "new economics" factor: " . . . This you can be sure of – Washington is in the economic business for good, as never before in our history. Unlimited laissez faire will soon be as extinct as the passenger pigeon." [It is incredible but nevertheless true that Repplier held that "unlimited laissez faire" still existed in 1966.]

Under Repplier's guidance, The Advertising Council became, for all practical purposes, a semi-official propaganda agency for statism and a leftwing internationalist foreign policy. It is of interest, therefore, to understand his attitude toward Communism, which, in his 1966 speech to the Magazine Publishers Association, he mentioned as the first factor causing government to invade our lives. He viewed Communism not as a military threat but rather as a worthy sociological competitor driving the American government toward paternalism.

Repplier said of international Communism: "When Lenin successfully imposed this doctrine on Russia . . . the handwriting of great changes for the world was written on the wall. For here was a fanatical movement imposed upon a country with an iron discipline, with repulsive cruelty, and a gigantic blood bath, but which nonetheless, in time, brought great benefits for the common man.

"Despite the negatives of communism, which all who have known freedom find so abhorrent, we can be blind to its attractions only at our peril. The free society and communism are in bitter, worldwide competition. They are being compared and weighed, like two products in a world supermarket.

"The Russia of today . . . is a far cry from the Russia of the czars. The little man is vastly better off. He is not free, but you do not miss much what you have never experienced. He is, however, relatively secure. He may not have much, but honesty compels us to admit he is better off than millions in our American slums. Whether Ivan is rich or poor, if his son or daughter has the brains for it, he or she can go to college and get paid while doing it. He is assured of a lifetime of good medical attention.

"In short, this competitive Communist society is pushing us in the direction of more social benefits for our citizens, lest we be outshone by our competition."

Repplier's unbridled admiration for the development of socialism in the Soviet Union explains in great part The Advertising Council's enthusiastic support of statist, collectivist projects in the United States.

Before Repplier relinquished the Council's presidency in 1966 to his long-time associate, Robert Keim, he supervised one more campaign for the United Nations. The earlier campaigns with their provocative and controversial nature were not emulated. Instead, the political characteristics of the United Nations were ignored and Americans were told that the United Nations is "a nice place to visit" because it is "educational, inspirational – What's more, It's fun."

Under Robert Keim's direction, The Advertising Council has continued to promote the United Nations, savings bonds, the Peace Corps, Radio Free Europe, mental health, civil defense, and other projects favored by the left-of-center.

One critic of The Advertising Council noted: "This is not free advertising that The Advertising Council is using to propagandize on a controversial subject. All advertising has to be paid for somewhere along the line. Business advertising has to cost more to make up for the so-called free U.N. advertising. The public pays for it as consumer, stockholder, or as taxpayer making up for the reduction in income taxes on business . . . . The device of squeezing this so-called free, pro-U.N., anti-U.S., advertising out of broadcasters who are forced to seek favor with the Federal Communications Commission is completely unfair to the business man, the advertising profession and the free enterprise system."

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was founded in 1915. As of 1970, it had approximately 90,000 members. ("Membership in the American Association of University Professors is open to teachers and research scholars on the faculties of approved colleges and universities [those on the lists of the established regional or professional accrediting agencies, subject to modification by action of the Association], and to present or recent graduate students of those institutions.")

Throughout its history, the AAUP has had as its main concerns academic freedom and academic tenure. (At the present time, its other concerns include: professional ethics; college and university teaching, research, and publication; accrediting of colleges and universities; relationships of higher education to federal and state governments; faculty responsibility for the academic freedom of students; college and university government; and the economic status of the profession.)

The first important statement on academic freedom by the AAUP was made in 1926: "(a) A university or college may not place any restraint upon the teacher's freedom in investigation, unless restriction upon the amount of time devoted to it becomes necessary in order to prevent undue interference with teaching duties. (b) A university or college may not impose any limitation upon the teacher's freedom in the exposition of his own subject in the classroom or in addresses and publications outside the college, except insofar as the necessity of adapting instruction to the needs of immature students, or in the case of institutions of a denominational or partisan character, specific stipulations in advance, fully understood and accepted by both parties, limit the scope and character of instruction. (c) No teacher may claim as his right the privilege of discussing in his classroom controversial topics outside of his own field of study. The teacher is morally bound not to take advantage of his position by introducing into the classroom provocative discussions of irrelevant subjects not within the field of his study. (d) A university or college should recognize that the teacher in speaking and writing outside of the institution upon subjects beyond the scope of his own field of study is entitled to precisely the same freedom and is subject to the same responsibility as attach to all other citizens. If the extramural utterances of a teacher should be such as to raise grave doubts concerning his fitness for his position, the question should in all cases be submitted to an appropriate committee of the faculty of which he is a member."

In 1940, the AAUP issued an updated version of its principles: "(a) The teacher is entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results, subject to the adequate performance of his other academic duties; but research for pecuniary return should be based upon an understanding with the authorities of the institution. (b) The teacher is entitled to freedom in the classroom in discussing his subject, but he should be careful not to introduce into his teaching controversial matter which has no relation to his subject. Limitations of academic freedom because of religious or other aims of the institution should be clearly stated in writing at the time of the appointment. (c) The college or university teacher is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of an educational institution. When he speaks or writes as a citizen, he should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but his special position in the community imposes special obligations. As a man of learning and an educational officer, he should remember that the public may judge his profession and his institution by his utterances. Hence he should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that he is not an institutional spokesman."

In the meantime, the AAUP had attracted the attention of the Communist Party. Writing in *The Communist* ("The Schools and the People's Front," May 1937, pp. 432-443), Richard Frank (a pseudonym) said: "The task of the Communist Party must be first and foremost to arouse the teachers to class-consciousness and to organize them into the American Federation of Teachers, which is the main current of the American Labor movement. In the effort to organize the teachers, every care must be taken to bring together in united front actions all existing teacher organizations. Especial attention must be paid to secure such action with the American Association of University Professors, the National Educational Association and the [Teachers] Guild. Our Party members in these organizations must work actively toward this end."

In 1947, a special committee of the AAUP issued a report stating: "So long as the Communist Party in the United States is a legal political party, affiliation with that party in and of itself should not be regarded as a justifiable reason for exclusion from the academic profession." The report ignored the indisputable fact that the so-called legal party, the CPUSA, was (1) a very important part of the international Communist apparatus; (2) its leaders were directed by the Communist leaders in the Soviet Union; (3) its leaders had made it clear that they intended to use the academic profession as one of the means to achieve the overthrow of the United States government. Nevertheless, the report offered justification for its defense of Communists: "There is, then, nothing in the nature of the teaching profession which requires the automatic exclusion of Communists, and the attempt to exclude them would threaten our educational system with real dangers. Discrimination against Communists would readily lead to discrimination against teachers with other unorthodox political views, and the exclusion of such teachers would mean the exclusion of some of the liveliest intellects and most stimulating personalities on our campuses. Furthermore, the acceptance of political discrimination might well be the wolf's paw in the door; such discrimination might presently extend to other types of heterodoxy. Faculty members in general might take alarm, and sagaciously conclude that they cannot afford the luxury of ranging thought and bold speech. Our campuses would then lose the stimulus of clashing opinions and would become havens of cautious mediocrity. Having surrendered its function of preservation and transmission, it would be ready to become an instrument of indoctrination for an authoritarian society. This Association should recognize the danger inherent in political repression, and oppose it at the only point where it can successfully be opposed – at the beginning. And the first test may well be a teacher's right of choosing his political party." The 1947 special committee report did not become the official policy of the AAUP. But the report, despite its specious reasoning that equated the Communist Party with legitimate and indigenous American political parties, was printed in the Spring 1948 issue of the AAUP's *Bulletin.*

In 1953, at their annual convention, members of the AAUP adopted a resolution which – without using the terms "Communist" or "Communism" – virtually endorsed the 1947 report: "Experience has abundantly demonstrated that neither the organizational affiliations of a teacher, if lawful, nor his social, economic, political or religious opinions, however difficult for others to understand and however distasteful to others they may be, are sufficient evidence of disqualification for work in the academic profession." It had become obvious by 1953 that officials and members of the AAUP were subject to constant embarrassment as federal and state investigative committees were discovering that Communists were entrenched in administrative and teaching positions in large and small universities and colleges throughout the nation. Therefore, it was not surprising that the AAUP, in its 1953 convention, condemned all legislative investigations of Communists. The language of the condemnation bore a remarkable resemblance to that used by numerous educators in their appearances before investigative committees, especially those educators who used the Fifth Amendment when asked about their activities – not thoughts or opinions – in the Communist Party: "Legislative investigations which are in fact trials of individuals, based on thoughts and opinions, or on personal relationships, encroach upon and discourage freedom of thought, of inquiry, and of expression. Such investigations are, therefore, contrary to basic principles of our constitutional system and inimical to the welfare of the nation. Today, more than ever before, freedom to inquire, particularly freedom to study national and international relationships and problems upon which national policies must ultimately be based, requires freedom of thought, of inquiry, and of expression."

By 1956, the AAUP was still veiling its endorsement of Communist teachers behind the screen of a special committee report ("Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security") which was printed in the Spring 1956 issue of the AAUP's *Bulletin.*

The editor of *National Review,* William F. Buckley Jr., stripped away the camouflage and exposed the report as almost a clear endorsement of tenure for Communist teachers. In his column ("The Ivory Tower," April 11, 1956), Mr. Buckley wrote: " . . . The AAUP report . . . signals, in my opinion, not the recognition of a reality, but the formal beginning of a concerted movement to turn back the clock. It signals a drive for massive toleration of pro-Communism and recalcitrance before congressional committees, all under the blanket of academic freedom and tenure. Specifically, the AAUP censured five colleges for firing professors who had pleaded the Fifth Amendment or otherwise refused to cooperate with congressional committees. The report, which sets down the AAUP's position on such matters, is remarkable for its similarity to other such manifestoes of days gone by. Clichés which, one was justified in assuming as recently as a year ago, were so tired that they could never get up and walk again are here in their pristine impudence, parading out of the mouths of academic tyros. Listen to some extracts from the report: First some straight reign-of-terror talk: '. . . the readiness of political and economic groups and of individual politicians to play upon the natural fears of the American people, and to suppress legitimate opinions and activities, have all combined to produce distrust of persons and organizations thought to be even remotely dangerous and to encourage extreme actions against them.'

"Then the warning about how political persecution in America threatens to leave us in a poor competitive position vis-à-vis the Soviet Union (where such problems do not, presumably, occur): '. . . our security and welfare are substantially impaired by the recognized insufficiency of the supply of qualified scientists, engineers and foreign service officers and by the human suffering inflicted through unwarranted or crudely conducted investigations and dismissals.'

"Ex-Communist teachers should not necessarily be expected to divulge to congressional committees or to the FBI the names of former comrades. For teachers are quite naturally inhibited from doing such things due to the 'popular prejudice against informers as such.' Moreover, 'there is also reason to sympathize with a person who declines to aid in the ruin of others who, in his judgment, do not deserve such a fate.'

"Nor should a teacher be dismissed merely for pleading the Fifth Amendment: 'Any rule which bases dismissal upon the mere fact of exercise of Constitutional rights violates the principles of both academic freedom and academic tenure . . . . The variety of reasons which have induced witnesses to invoke the Fifth Amendment, moreover, renders the policy of attaching prima facie blameworthiness to their conduct thoroughly unrealistic.'

"And, finally, the logical extension of the argument. Not said in so many words, but said in effect: membership in the Communist Party is not, in and of itself, reason to dismiss a teacher. It is regrettable that the academic community should, bowing to the Philistines, ever have thought so: 'It clearly would have been better for the health of higher education in this country if academic institutions had refused to be stampeded, and had insisted that competence and satisfactory performance in teaching or research, and good character in relation to these functions, are the matters to be judged when academic tenure is at stake.' "

The special committee report of 1956 concluded: "To maintain a healthy state of thought and opinion in this country, it is desirable for adherents of Communism, like those of other forms of revolutionary thought, to present their views, especially in colleges and universities, so that they may be checked by open discussion . . . . We urge that American colleges and universities return to a full-scale acceptance of intellectual controversy based upon a catholicity of viewpoint, for the sake of national strength as well as for academic reasons."

No matter how carefully couched were the sentiments in the vehicle of the special report, the AAUP – by 1956 – was clearly defending tenure for Communists and Fifth Amendment pleaders. And in the concluding remarks of the report, the AAUP encouraged universities and colleges to hire Communists "for the sake of national strength" (i.e., hire an adherent of the nation's most powerful enemy to build up the resistance of the nation) and "for academic reasons" (i.e., hire a Communist with his disciplined mind so that he can promote his one-sided propaganda in a classroom, where the undisciplined and unprepared minds of his students can check him "by open discussion").

In other proceedings of the 1956 AAUP convention, Washington University was condemned because its administration fired two Communist professors. The censure of the AAUP was levied against six institutions (University of California, Ohio State University, Temple University, Rutgers University, Oklahoma University, and Jefferson Medical School) because their respective administrations had fired Communists or individuals who had refused to deny, under oath, Communist affiliations. At the same time, six institutions (Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Chicago, Johns Hopkins University, Cornell University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Harvard University) were commended because their respective administrations had been uncooperative with legislative investigating committees. (Censure was later lifted from Temple University and Rutgers University when those two institutions amended their constitutions so that Communists or recalcitrant witnesses could not be fired.)

In 1958, the University of Michigan and Dickinson College were censured for firing faculty members who either refused to testify about or refused to deny their Communist affiliations, under oath, before investigating committees. Fisk University and New York University were censured in 1959 for similar reasons.

In 1958, the AAUP instituted its annual Alexander Meiklejohn Award for Academic Freedom. (The award was in honor of a notorious fellow-traveler who had spent a lifetime trying his best to corrupt education in the name of radical permissiveness, designed to break down academic discipline. To Communists in America, Meiklejohn had the status of a folk hero.)

The first Meiklejohn award went to the University of New Hampshire's board of trustees because its members, in 1956, sanctioned an appearance before the student body of Paul M. Sweezy. Sweezy, at the time, was under a contempt citation of New Hampshire's Supreme Court. He was one of the most notorious Soviet apologists and active fellow-travelers in the country. Nevertheless, the AAUP lauded the trustees "for their service to academic freedom." (The chairman of the Meiklejohn award committee was Ralph F. Fuchs of Indiana University, who said the University of New Hampshire board of trustees "has set a courageous and successful example of responsible educational statesmanship, from which the proponents of liberal education everywhere can take heart." Fuchs had been affiliated with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ["a Communist front" – "subversive"] and the American League for Peace and Democracy ["subversive and Communist"]. In 1938, Fuchs was carried on a list at Communist Party headquarters of Communist sympathizers "who have contributed money and, in some instances, personal services." Fuchs was a top official of the AAUP: vice president, 1950-1951; general secretary, 1955-1957; counsel, 1957-1960; and president, 1960-1962.)

In 1962, the Meiklejohn award went to Arthur S. Flemming for allowing Communist Party Chairman Gus Hall to speak on the University of Oregon's campus. The Communists gloated in their *Worker* (May 1, 1962): "The victorious struggle of the students and faculty of the University of Oregon, to hear Gus Hall speak early in February, became a nation-wide symbol last week for freedom of speech throughout America's colleges and universities. On Friday, the

American Association of University Professors annual meeting in Chicago gave its annual Alexander Meiklejohn Award to Arthur S. Flemming, President of the University of Oregon and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under President Eisenhower."

On September 29, 1959, Representative Francis E. Walter, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, brought the activities of the AAUP to the attention of his colleagues: "The American Association of University Professors has, over the course of the last few years, followed the trail of the Committee on Un-American Activities like a dog after a meat wagon. Contrary to the propaganda of the communists and their sympathizers, the Committee on Un-American Activities has never investigated education, labor, professional groups, or any segment of our society as such. We follow the trail of communists wherever they lead. On several occasions in the course of the last few years we have found members of the Communist Party who were engaged as professors in schools or colleges. On most of these occasions the school or college in which the communists were employed have fired them, but consistently and promptly the American Association of University Professors has issued a censorship of those schools or colleges for firing the communist on the grounds that it was an interference with *academic freedom* . . . the American Association of University Professors still thinks that a communist professor is something less than a communist and that it is wrong to remove him from the arena in which he can do his most deadly work."

Mr. Walter returned to the topic on October 10, 1962: "Mr. Speaker, teachers, men of learning, true intellectuals, have always been admired, respected, and honored by civilized societies. I am glad to say that this condition prevails in the United States today. The American people recognize the great contribution many intellectuals have made – and are now making – to our Nation. This applies not only in the field of defense, where we are dependent on them to such a great degree for our very survival, but in other fields such as the arts, humanities, and political theory.

"Despite this, it must be said that there is in the minds of a considerable number of Americans a certain suspicion of intellectuals. This unhappy fact has not been brought about by the majority of intellectuals, nor is it due basically to a failing of the American people. Contrary to what some so-called intellectuals would have us believe, the people of this country are not ignorant, primitive-minded clods who are fundamentally anti-intellectual and, therefore, distrustful of education and mental ability, and development as such. Rather, this distrust of intellectuals is caused by the fact that a minority, but very vocal and aggressive, element in the intellectual community – an element composed, for the most part, of those who have achieved no real eminence in it and which has been exalted far beyond its worth in the liberal press – has, by its words and actions, given the American public a false image of what the intellectuals of this country are really like. They have created a picture of a group of eggheads, educated beyond their mental capacities, living in a completely unreal world, uninformed about the basic issues related to national survival and incapable of thinking about them intelligently . . . .

"Now, the AAUP is not truly representative of the intellectuals of this country. It is not even truly representative of the professors of this country. It is very definitely a professorial minority group. It claims membership equal to about one-fifth of the total number of professors in this land. However, because of the way the *Washington Post* and some other newspapers play up the organization, many people have been led to believe that it speaks for the majority of our college and university professors. Its inanities thus tend to discredit many intellectuals who deserve to be held in much higher esteem by the American people."

Mr. Walter quoted criticism of the AAUP made by the ultra-liberal Sidney Hook, professor at New York University, who said of the AAUP's special committee ("Academic Freedom and Tenure in the Quest for National Security"): "(1) The AAUP committee 'goes on to advocate a policy which seemingly suggests that a college is actually failing in its educational duty unless members of the Communist Party are teaching on the campus.' (2) The odd thing about the position of the AAUP on this question [of the Communist professors] is that it has never permitted its membership to discuss the issue fairly in the pages of its bulletin or to hear it debated by competent representatives of both sides before a national meeting. It has loaded the pages of the bulletin with only one position. It has refused point-blank to invite any speaker known to differ with the official position."

Mr. Walter concluded: "The AAUP is an organization of so-called intellectuals that has brought, and continues to bring, discredit on the true intellectuals of this country."

The AAUP did not confine itself to the protection of Communist professors and Fifth Amendment pleaders. It became involved in many issues of a controversial nature. Its positions on these issues were not reflective of the entire membership but rather were imposed by the AAUP's top leadership through the reports and recommendations of highly-biased select committees.

In its 1960 annual meeting, the AAUP adopted resolutions on student demonstrations, segregation, *apartheid,* and the disclaimer affidavit (to prevent Communists from receiving federal educational funds). On the matter of student demonstrations, the AAUP observed "with sorrow and indignation the action of college and university authorities who have disciplined, suspended, or expelled students for protesting in peaceful ways against racial discrimination. Such action constitutes an abuse of academic authority. Since not every conviction under law necessarily represents an offense with which an educational institution must concern itself, it is incumbent upon educational authorities to reach their own decisions in these situations. Not to do so constitutes a failure in the exercise of academic authority. The academic community should not restrict the civil rights of students. We call upon the authorities of colleges and universities not to be misled by public pressures into punitive action which impairs the learning process and destroys the civil liberties of students."

Under the heading of "Higher Education and Segregation," the AAUP resolved: "In the face of threats to close publicly-supported educational institutions or to discredit public and private institutions for the purpose of preserving racial segregation, the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors reaffirms the resolutions of the three preceding Annual Meetings. It again endorses the principles set forth by the United States Supreme Court in decisions providing for the elimination of racial segregation in publicly-supported educational institutions. It again commends institutions, both public and private, which have made progress in implementing the principle that race should not be a condition for educational opportunity. It condemns the willingness of some governmental bodies and private groups to sacrifice public education in order to maintain racial segregation.

"The Annual Meeting further reaffirms the principle that every teacher has the right, both as teacher and as citizen, to be active in organizations which exert their influence toward the provision of educational opportunity without racial segregation; and it specifically condemns legislation or administrative action which would deny to teachers or students the right to membership in any organization seeking by constitutional means the elimination of racial segregation.

"Finally, this Annual Meeting particularly commends those scholars and teachers who have courageously resisted public pressures and have continued to give their best effort to resolving the problems involved in desegregation."

A gratuitous intrusion of the AAUP into the internal affairs of South Africa was made by a resolution, *South African Policy of Apartheid:* "In the action taken by the government of the Union of South Africa to change the University College of Fort Hare from an institution open to non-white students from many parts of the world to an institution open only to members of the Xhosa tribe, the academic profession has witnessed one of the tragic consequences of the South African policy of *apartheid.* By a single stroke of government, the liberating curriculum and tradition of the University College, evolved over more than four decades through the perception and dedication of its widely respected staff, have been sacrificed to dictates which run counter to the basic concepts of liberal education.

"The sympathies of the Forty-sixth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors go to those at the University College who have labored to achieve and maintain a position of eminence for their institution. In particular, our sympathies go to those members of the staff who submitted their resignations rather than accept the restrictions imposed upon them by the government, or who were dismissed by the Minister of Bantu Education, without opportunity for a hearing, because they were believed to be 'sabotaging the policy of *apartheid.*' We commend these persons, now faced with the difficult task of relocating, to our American institutions, secure in the thought that in bringing them to this country we will enrich our own faculties with men and women who represent the highest ideals of the profession."

Beginning in 1959, the AAUP annually adopted a resolution urging the Congress to repeal the Disclaimer Affidavit requirement of the National Defense Education Act. Although the affidavit was simply a means of preventing Communists and their fellow travelers from receiving taxpayers' money for educational purposes, the AAUP characterized the affidavit as "discriminating and subversive," as creating "grave problems of federal control over the educational process" and raising "serious constitutional questions . . . , for it seems to approve the concept that 'belief' as opposed to overt action may be a basis for sanctions." The AAUP was lavish in its praise of the colleges and universities which publicly registered their protest against the affidavit requirements, and in particular of those which refused to accept the benefits of the National Defense Education Act while the affidavit requirement remained in effect.

In 1957, the AAUP began an annual endorsement of desegregation. Its 1962 resolution read: "The Forty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors reaffirms the resolutions of the preceding five Annual Meetings in supporting efforts to implement the 1954 decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Brown v. Board of Education.* It commends the growing number of institutions which select their students solely on the basis of merit rather than race, color, or creed and expresses the hope that the number of such institutions will increase rapidly. It further reaffirms the right of faculty members and students at any public or private institution to express by words or nonviolent actions their views on desegregation without fear of reprisal, and to participate in organizations which exert their influence toward the provision of educational opportunity without racial segregation.

"This Annual Meeting endorses the conclusions in the 1961 United States Commission on Civil Rights Report that 'Federal support of higher educational institutions that do not comply with constitutional principles is unconscionable and should be terminated,' and that 'There is no justification for delay in compliance with constitutional requirements in institutions of higher education.' It urges immediate implementation of the resulting recommendation of the Commission 'That the Federal Government, either by executive or by congressional action, take such measures as may be required to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to such publicly controlled institutions of higher education as do not discriminate on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin.' The Forty-Eighth Annual Meeting further supports the recommendation of four of the Commissioners that 'as a matter of sound public policy the same principle should be extended to privately controlled institutions.' "

The AAUP's attitude toward campus demonstrations was, as early as 1962, one of permissiveness toward so-called peaceful protests. There was, however, no indication by the AAUP as to when protests transcended peaceful procedures. Furthermore, the AAUP condoned violation of "community ordinances" in the name of academic freedom. On "The Use of Disciplinary Power by Institutional Authorities," the 1962 annual meeting adopted a resolution stating that it "commends those institutional authorities who have reacted with understanding to the actions of faculty members and students peacefully protesting against social injustices in their communities. It recognizes that such protests often require that those involved choose between their academic obligations and the dictates of individual conscience, and that their decisions sometimes create problems with which institutional authorities must deal. The Forty-Eighth Annual Meeting urges institutional authorities faced with such problems to follow the example of those who have refused to take punitive action which would violate the academic freedom and civil rights of faculty members or students.

"The public protest of faculty members and students may on occasion result in violations of community ordinances or institutional regulations. With regard to the first, institutional authorities are reminded that not every conviction under law represents an offense with which an educational institution must concern itself, and that they should reach their own decisions in these situations. Not to do so constitutes a failure in the exercise of academic authority. With regard to the second, no penalty should be inflicted beyond that which might be expected under ordinary circumstances. In either case, unusual punishment, or the yielding to community pressures in the determination of punishment, constitutes an abuse of academic authority which impairs the learning process and restricts the academic freedom of faculty members and students alike."

In January 1962, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Cunningham Amendment to the Postage Revision Act. The Amendment was designed to prevent the wholesale distribution of unsolicited Communist propaganda, emanating from Communist nations, through the services of the United States Mail. In a totally misleading protest, the AAUP charged that "scholars, libraries, and colleges and universities would be denied, or handicapped in obtaining, access to books, pamphlets, magazines, and newspapers which, in the judgment of the Attorney General, were Communist political propaganda." The 1962 annual meeting of the AAUP resolved that the Cunningham Amendment was "an unwarranted invasion of educational freedom. It believes that the best interests of the United States and of American education can be served only if publications from all nations are freely accessible. Moreover, the Cunningham Amendment, by endangering access to information, thus places faith in ignorance and threatens to defeat the ends of free scholarship."

Federal-"aid"-to-education has had no stronger supporters than the top officials of the AAUP, who refuse to acknowledge that federal subsidies inevitably lead to federal control. The 1962 AAUP resolution on "Federal Aid to Higher Education" expressed gratitude "for the interest of both the Executive and the Legislative branches of the Federal Government in extending increased financial aid to higher education. Recognizing the pressing need for additional resources to assist higher education in the difficult years ahead, it hopes that the efforts of these two branches of the Federal Government will make it possible for American institutions of higher education to provide both the facilities essential for giving their students the highest quality of education and the funds necessary to attract and hold faculty members of high scholarly promise or attainment. It will be expected that such federal aid will have the necessary safeguards to maintain a mutual independence of church and state and to assure freedom from government control of the educational programs of our institutions of higher education."

In its 1965 meeting, the AAUP verged on hysteria when it adopted a resolution on "Attacks and Limitations on Intellectual Freedom." Strawmen and bogies were raised and shot down: "[The AAUP expresses] its commitment to every public and private action which expands the area of intellectual freedom in teaching and research; in supporting the freest possible international movement of scholars and ideas; in favoring the expansion of cultural exchange programs with all other countries; in stressing the importance of providing protection for visiting scholars by all countries and the importance of freedom from restrictions by passport and visa-granting authorities on scholars whose research requires them to travel abroad.

"The Fifty-First Annual Meeting also expresses deep concern over the efforts of various groups in our time to enforce rigid and dogmatic concepts of political and social conformity upon the academic community. The misuse of the struggle against communism and other ideologies to justify the abridgment of freedom of inquiry and teaching can only result in undermining the entire system of higher education."

At the 1965 meeting, the AAUP renewed its protests against federal restrictions on the distribution of unsolicited Communist propaganda. It once again commended the federal government for its subsidization of various facets of education, no matter the violations of the Constitution of the United States involved in such subsidies. The extravagant spending programs of the Johnson Administration received a glowing endorsement in an AAUP resolution: "[The AAUP] commends particularly their [Lyndon Johnson and the 89th Congress] efforts to ensure the disadvantaged in our society a full share in educational opportunity; it commends their efforts to advance the humanities and the arts equally with science and technology. It calls upon the states and all eligible institutions to provide the agencies and procedures necessary to ensure the complete and acceptable implementation of these programs."

In 1965, the AAUP was especially concerned that there were still individuals in the federal and state governments who were unwilling that Communists be given the same privileges as Americans of undivided loyalty. Without ever mentioning "Communists" or "Communism," the AAUP adopted a resolution: "The Fifty-First Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors is deeply concerned by actions taken or proposed during the past year in federal and state legislation calling for disclaimers of disloyalty and compulsory inquiry into loyalties and criminal records of those participating in federally aided programs. It finds abhorrent to the basic principles of a free society the revival in the Economic Opportunity Act of the discredited disclaimer affidavit requirement providing for tests of belief and association. Such a demeaning requirement is to be particularly condemned because it is applied to the disadvantaged in our society as a price for the help they are offered.

"The Fifty-First Annual Meeting also finds objectionable the inclusion of provisions in existing and proposed legislation for federal aid which accept a test of one's association as an appropriate basis for governmental assistance, and which call for indiscriminate inquiry into past criminal record of whatever nature. Such provisions or proposals reflect gratuitously upon the academic community; by including convictions based on civil rights activity, or on actions in vindication of general constitutional rights, they represent inquiry into beliefs as well as associations; and they threaten the academic and related freedoms necessary to achieve the very objectives of such legislation.

"The Fifty-First Annual Meeting condemns further the persistent efforts in certain states to require loyalty oaths, to ban speakers, to censor or limit the sale or choice of books, to enact criminal syndicalism statutes, and to make unwarranted inquiries into personal associations. Such efforts, even when unsuccessful, threaten and hamper academic freedom; reflect unfairly upon both the faculties and administrations of colleges and universities; and represent an improper intrusion into the conduct of our institutions of higher education."

The 1965 meeting of the AAUP also set the tone for what soon developed into widespread demonstrations against universities and colleges where government contracts, especially defense department, were held for research purposes. The AAUP resolved to express "its concern over the tendency in recent years to exploit institutions of higher education for purely utilitarian and transitory purposes. The Association is committed to policies which result in maximum support of higher education, but it does not favor practices which tend to transfer the control of major segments of institutional functions from the hands of faculties to external authorities. The Annual Meeting urges the responsible policy-making bodies in institutions of higher education to examine carefully those research contracts and foundation grants whose execution may violate established institutional goals and responsibilities."

Under the heading of "Political Freedom," the AAUP resorted to vague language in a resolution designed to support the disruptive activities that were plaguing campuses across the nation: "The Fifty-First Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors expresses its deep concern over the penalizing of students and faculty members for participation in political activities, particularly in protests against racial discrimination and in other actions supporting civil rights. Institutions of higher learning have the responsibility to uphold the right of members of the academic community to engage in political activities consonant with the principles underlying the Bill of Rights. They also have the right to make and enforce reasonable regulations relating to the time, place, and manner of the exercise of these rights, in order to prevent interference with their educational programs.

"When institutions take disciplinary action, the principles of due process as formulated by the American Association of University

Professors must be strictly observed. It cannot be overemphasized that members of the academic community are also citizens possessing the rights – and subject to the responsibilities – of all citizens. These rights are not abrogated by membership in the academic community and must not be restricted by capricious institutional discipline. Violations of these basic rights are an abuse of administrative authority and inevitably weaken an institution's academic integrity."

In 1966, the AAUP returned to its "concerns" over research contracts on campuses ("the tendency in recent years to exploit institutions of higher education for purely utilitarian and transitory purposes"). Anti-draft demonstrators were subject of a solicitous and ultra-leftwing-pacifist AAUP resolution: "The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors believes that it is intolerable for persons to be reclassified under Selective Service because of their participation in demonstrations and movements which express their views upon current problems within our society. Any penalties imposed upon individuals because of conduct which may violate the criminal law or interfere with the Selective Service System should be imposed as a result of due process in our courts. Freedom of expression and political action is far too precious and fragile to be restricted by risk of penalty imposed by either a multitude of lay boards or an administrative commission whose functions are executive rather than judicial."

In the 1965-1966 school year, the appearance of Communists on campuses became rather commonplace. From 1961 to 1965, Communist Party speakers averaged fifty campus appearances a year. In the 1965-1966 academic year, sixty-nine appearances were made by Herbert Aptheker, Thomas Dennis, Louis Diskin, Gil Green, Dorothy Healey, James Jackson, Arnold Johnson, Anthony Krchmarek, Claude Lightfoot, Hyman Lumer, George Meyers, Mortimer Daniel Rubin, and John Stanford – a representative group of the Communist Party's hierarchy.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified about the growing phenomenon: "The party's most aggressive programs in its ceaseless campaign to gain legitimacy as just another political party on the American scene are aimed toward young people. Five years ago the party instituted a program of sending its speakers to college campuses. From the party's point of view this program has achieved a measure of respect and authority unmatched in the past two decades. In view of the fact that students constitute a primary Communist target group, the Communist Party – U.S.A. has continued to concentrate on having party spokesmen appear on college and university campuses across the country . . . .

"In all their public appearances, especially before draft-age college students, Communist speakers hit hard at the United States for its role in the Vietnam war. The party feels that our Nation is witnessing a new upsurge of 'leftist' thinking among young people which makes the Communist message more palatable. The party, of course, is exploiting this trend.

"Communist speakers enjoy the controversy their scheduled appearances on college campuses frequently provoke because it enables them to assume completely the undeserved role of a persecuted defender of free speech . . . .

"Communist speakers have stock answers for questions asked of them during their public appearances. For example, they blandly state that the Communist Party – U.S.A. has no organizational ties with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; that the Hungarian Government specifically requested the aid of Soviet troops during the Hungarian uprising of 1956; and that the Communists, if they ever attain power in this country, will allow a free press to exist because this is the American tradition . . . .

"There are those who say that it is proper and fitting for the Communists to present their views before student groups. We all believe in academic freedom but this does not grant license to deliberately present distortions or falsehoods. Communists are not obligated morally or otherwise to seek for or to tell the truth. Some young people are capable of recognizing and exposing propaganda and propagandists. Others are not. This is the dangerous thing, particularly when it is recognized that the Communists in this country are conducting an energetic propaganda campaign to recruit young people to the Communist banner."

At its 1966 meeting, the AAUP resolved that it "regards the freedom to hear as an essential attribute of every community of scholars, an indispensable condition of all universities, and an inseparable part of academic freedom. It reaffirms the principle that the common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free expression, and that students should be free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly or privately. It believes that the right to examine and search for truth is prejudiced to the extent that the university is open to some but not to others whom members of the university are also concerned to hear.

"The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting believes that the right to access to speakers on campus does not in its exercise imply in advance either agreement or disagreement with what may be said, or approval or disapproval of the speakers as individuals. It believes further that there can be no more appropriate forum for the voluntary examination of ideas and of men than a university forum.

"The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting therefore strongly urges that no prior restraint be imposed on the right of members of an academic community to invite and to hear on campus any person of their own choosing."

Imaginary "repression" haunted the AAUP in its resolution on "Limitations and Attacks on Intellectual Freedom." The resolution provided no case histories but did carry the implication that the AAUP was worried that foreign Communists might be excluded from American campuses. The resolution mentioned an undocumented "tendency" to threats against intellectual freedom, and in its full context, it was a warped defense of academic freedom: "The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors reaffirms its support of the freest possible international movement of scholars and ideas. It favors the expansion of cultural exchange programs with all other countries. It urges the importance of protection for visiting scholars by all countries and of freedom from restrictions by passport and visa-granting authorities on scholars whose research requires them to travel abroad. It particularly deplores the infringement of academic freedom by unwarranted surveillance of such scholars.

"The Fifty-Second Annual Meeting also deplores the recent tendency to view faculty and student criticism of American foreign policy as unhealthy and inimical to the best interests of the nation. It reiterates that teachers and students are entitled, as citizens, to the same freedom of expression as other citizens, including expression of dissent from governmental policies, and that, as members of the academic community, scholars have a special obligation to pursue truth and express it to the best of their ability. Any abridgment of these rights is a fundamental denial of the nature of intellectual inquiry and the academic freedom it requires."

President John P. Leary, S.J. of Gonzaga University described an encounter he had with the AAUP. Writing in *University Bookman* ("The AAUP: Blessing or Danger?," Spring 1966), he told of how the AAUP had demanded that he grant tenure to an individual with a bachelor's degree, who had only three years' service at the University. Among his observations, Father Leary said: "The American Association of University Professors is well on its way to becoming one of the most to-be-reckoned-with powers in the land, having emerged from the relative vacuum of a decade ago. Unless some sane and discriminating check is devised, I would maintain as the central point in these remarks, the AAUP may do much damage to our schools of higher learning. To be chief articulator for the brainpower of this country is a mission so delicate and far flung in its implications that it staggers the imagination. Such power deserves a counterbalance; but thus far, however intelligent its membership may be, its leadership has resembled boss unionism at its worst.

"There can be no doubt that the AAUP or some group with related objectives was needed: growth in higher education has been momentous. And if commentators and critics have felt that the Berkeley situation was at least in part provoked by the organized impersonalism of a giant hive where nobody was really anybody, save those at the top, then the teachers of those nameless thousands were not far behind as more forgotten men. It is unpleasant to be lost in anonymity. Large organizations tend to become calculating; the more removed men are from decision-making power, the more they may be treated as decimals in a computer.

"Pressures, furthermore, have mounted enormously in college education: pressures for higher standards, pressures from the press, public opinion polls, parents, alumni, regents, state legislatures. The weak cave in under such pressures. They may hire and fire, promote or hold back indiscriminately. Individuals then are at the mercy of caprice; so the intellectuals, like others, have recoiled defensively against the day when . . . .

"To prevent undue damage, in a negative sort of way, therefore, and to augment, positively, the voice of the professor in the university, the AAUP sprang into existence. The idea behind the Association made sense originally, and still does. But agencies, like people, are best known, of course, by the way in which they operate . . . . "

Father Leary recounted how the AAUP investigated, prosecuted, judged, and executed the case against Gonzaga in proceedings that lasted more than four years. The result was that Gonzaga gave in to the high-handed pressure tactics of the AAUP. Gonzaga's capitulation was due to many factors and Father Leary was unhappy with the outcome. He concluded, rather optimistically: "Some day, maybe five years from now, AAUP will have grown up a bit. And people like me intend to help them become what they have the power to become. This means they get with it in their own procedures and recognize the power and effectiveness of negotiation, the split and impartial membership in hearings, the more graduated and realistic categories for salary scores (if these should be published at all). AAUP must come to prize innocence, cherish it, not kick the small because they're small. Reputation is built up through years of labor. The idle tampering with or destruction of a good name, with, at best, ambiguous cause, is shameful and does damage to the high mission AAUP has set for itself.

"Liberals, almost by their very nature, are always looking for something else. They are the advocates of the not-here-yet, critics par excellence. I like to think I am liberal. The AAUP is liberal. I wonder if they can take criticism and meditate on it, as well as issue it."

In 1967, the AAUP was again concerned with "restraints on visiting speakers" on campuses. It was again obvious that the AAUP, without mentioning them, was desirous that Communists be welcomed to university and college speakers' platforms: "The Fifty-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors affirms its belief that the freedom to hear is an essential condition of a university community and an inseparable part of academic freedom. It believes that the right to examine issues and seek truth is prejudiced to the extent that the university is open to some but not to others whom members of the university also judge desirable to hear. It further believes that no more appropriate forum exists for the voluntary examination of ideas and of men than that provided by a university. It therefore joins the Fifty-second Annual Meeting in urging that no prior restraint be imposed on the right of members of an academic community to invite and to hear on campus any person of their own choosing."

In the 1966-1967 academic year, Communist Party leaders made fifty-four campus appearances. The leaders were Herbert Aptheker, Fred Blair, Louis Diskin, Gus Hall, Dorothy Healey, Robert Heisler, Donald Hamerquist, Arnold Johnson, James Kennedy, Bettina

Aptheker Kurzweil, Mortimer Daniel Rubin, Art Shields, Milford Sutherland, Henry Winston, and Michael Zagarell.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover contradicted the specious reasoning behind the AAUP's solicitude for Communist speakers. Mr. Hoover testified: "Among other things, the party hopes to capitalize on the radicalism of the so-called new left movement. The basic purpose, however, behind the speaking campaign, which has been pursued with vigor since the early 1960's, is to gain recognition for and acceptance of the Communist Party-U.S.A. as a legitimate political party on the American scene. The party considers that college campuses offer an excellent opportunity to reach the youth who will be the leaders of tomorrow. The Communists also know there is a certain amount of prestige attached to a speaking engagement at educational institutions and that the party gains just by reason of the appearance of the Communist speaker on the campus.

"These speakers make much of the fact that freedom of speech and related freedoms in this country give them the right to deliver the Communist message. However, the speakers do not tell the true story of communism, what it is really like in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, of the Communist ambitions for world domination, and the like. Since the true Communist aims are concealed, the Communist speakers make no significant contributions within the academic community to the pursuit of truth through the acquisition of knowledge. When considering the Communist appearances on the campuses of numerous colleges on balance, the academic community has gained less in the knowledge of communism than the Communist Party has in notoriety and propaganda."

At its 1967 meeting, the AAUP took notice of the increasing number of campuses where students were demonstrating to the point of terrorism and demanding a large role in making policy for both large and small universities and colleges. Couched in a resolution, the AAUP advised appeasement: "The Fifty-third Annual Meeting . . . considers that the student unrest and tension on many campuses often arises from legitimate concerns, ranging from the increases in the size of institutions and the mechanization of procedures to the impersonality and rigidity of institutional authority. The Annual Meeting recommends to faculty and administrations that they re-examine practices and policies concerning students and that student representatives be responsibly involved in such re-examinations."

By 1967, leftwing agitators were becoming more and more critical of the Vietnam War and war in general. It was part of the Red-pacifist line that educational research facilities, subsidized by the defense department, were corruptive of academic freedom. Student and faculty protesters raised the phony specter of the military-industrial complex. And the AAUP, in its 1967 resolution on "Government Aid and Educational Goals," displayed its empathy with the growing surge of leftwing-pacifism: "The Fifty-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors expresses its appreciation to the President of the United States, to members of this administration, and to members of Congress for their continued support of higher education. It notes with concern, however, the large involvement of the military establishment in current financial support. It commends efforts being made both within and outside the Association to examine thoughtfully the complex issues raised by large-scale federal support of higher education, particularly that involving individual and institutional research directed toward defense and military application. It urges that until resolution of these matters can be found, institutions of higher learning inspect with great care the consequences of their research relationships in the area of defense with respect to the autonomy and freedom of academic societies."

Various law enforcement agencies noted that many campus demonstrators were affiliated with organizations that operated on a nationwide basis. Some of the organizations were deemed to be either subversive or tending to become so. Consequently, the leadership and membership of the organizations came under the scrutiny of investigators. Such diligence however was not appreciated by the AAUP which, in a resolution, discouraged educational institutions from cooperating with the investigators: "The Fifty-third Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors vigorously defends the right of students and faculty members to beliefs of all kinds and to free association. It condemns the actions of individuals and groups who, in disregard of basic constitutional principles, have sought or obtained information on personal beliefs and associations of students and faculty members for submission to governmental and private agencies. It similarly affirms its belief that student records are confidential and not to be released to outside agencies without the student's explicit permission."

At its 1968 meeting, the AAUP, in a series of resolutions, continued to criticize research contracts and restraints on visiting speakers. A resolution condemned any use by Selective Service of reclassification as a penalty for those interfering with Selective Service or related processes. The justification for the resolution said: "Resistance to Selective Service, including refusal of induction, by peaceful means which do not disrupt the normal educational functions of a college or university, should not be a basis for disciplinary action by the institution imposed upon either faculty members or students."

Another 1968 resolution displayed the AAUP's sympathy with drug users and even drug peddlers: "The Fifty-fourth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors notes with grave concern the traffic in and use of a variety of psychoactive drugs on college campuses across the nation. It notes with equal concern the proposed federal legislation which would treat as if they were the same a wide range of drugs whose properties and effects are inadequately known. This legislation would impose stringent criminal penalties for the mere possession of any such substances and provide still harsher penalties for 'disposition' of such substances to a person under 21 years of age. Consistent, uniform, and effective enforcement of such legislation is a formidable task, and uneven enforcement must invite disrespect for the law.

"The Meeting notes, moreover, that the recent Report of the Task Force on Narcotics and Drug Abuse of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice specifically rejected the mandatory minimum sentence as an approach to the drug problem and recommended that research be undertaken on the framework of sound and effective laws.

"The Meeting therefore urges that the Congress of the United States, before enacting regulatory legislation, create a National Commission which would authorize the conduct of scientific research into the physiological and psychological effects of psychoactive drugs, gather expert testimony on the economic and sociological effects of drug use, and make appropriate legislative recommendations."

By 1969, the AAUP had donned a hair shirt on the question of campus riots. The liberal lexicon of apologetics was used to divide the responsibility for the anarchical situation between students and administration that plagued many campuses. ("Demonstrations and confrontations on campuses across the nation are frequently a manifestation of deep and sometimes profoundly moral discontent arising out of social injustice, public policy, and, in some cases, out of inefficiency, irresponsibility, and unresponsiveness, within the institutions themselves.") The AAUP was particularly anxious to settle campus difficulties without interference of law enforcement authorities: "American colleges and universities have long cherished a tradition of institutional autonomy. Disruptive actions of militant students and faculty can profoundly threaten that autonomy because those actions may provoke distrust and hostility and lead to countermeasures on the part of other students, government, and the public. The current crisis can thus only be compounded by vengeful reprisals, such as repressive legislation, punitive reduction of public or private financing of higher education that will penalize all students alike, or the withdrawal, on outside initiative, of grants from students alleged to have taken part in riots. Regular academic procedures, when utilized, can provide sufficient sanctions, and it is both unjust and destructive of institutional autonomy for additional punitive measures to be automatically imposed by outside authority as a consequence of institutional discipline.

"Wherever possible, the maintenance of essential academic order should be the responsibility of the institutions themselves; breaches of that order by students should be judged by institutional tribunals, in accordance with the *Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students,* and breaches of academic order by faculty members should be dealt with in accordance with accepted professional standards. Academic due process, both procedural and substantive, must be guaranteed. Should the maintenance of academic order prove a task beyond the powers of regularly constituted institutional organs, and should it prove unhappily necessary to resort to the civil power, decisions as to its use should be made in the first instance by responsible administrative officers and faculty members in the service of academic criteria and not of political expediency. Thereafter every effort should be made to restore ordinary academic processes as quickly as possible."

On May 1, 1969, the Attorney General of the United States, John Mitchell, in a Law Day speech, said: "I call for an end to minority tyranny on the nation's campuses and for the immediate re-establishment of civil peace and protection of individual rights. If arrests must be made, then arrests there should be. If violators must be prosecuted, then prosecution there should be. It is no admission of defeat, as some may claim, to use reasonable physical force to eliminate physical force." Mr. Mitchell described campus violence as "a direct threat to academic freedom." He warned: "University administrators must take firm and immediate action. Faculty members should stop negotiating under the blackmail threat of violence. Apathetic students should stand up for the rights of those who wish to pursue civility and scholarship. When people may be injured, when personal property may be destroyed and when chaos begins, university officials only aid lawlessness by procrastination and negotiations."

On April 29, 1969, President Richard Nixon declared: "There can be no compromise with lawlessness and no surrender to force if free education is to survive." Mr. Nixon said he welcomed peaceful dissent, but that "when we find situations in numbers of colleges and universities which reach the point where students in the name of dissent and in the name of change terrorize other students and faculty members, when they rifle files, when they engage in violence, when they carry guns and knives in the classrooms, then I say it is time for faculties, boards of trustees and school administrators to have the backbone to stand up against this kind of situation."

The AAUP reacted strongly and swiftly to the remarks of Messrs. Mitchell and Nixon. On May 3, 1969, the AAUP – without mentioning either Mitchell or Nixon by name – adopted a resolution on "Law Enforcement and Academic Order": "The Fifty-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors notes with grave concern press reports of a recent series of provocative statements by high federal officials which threaten 'professional militants' allegedly responsible for disruption with prosecution for conspiracy, and which employ indiscriminate and dangerous phrases such as 'ideological criminals' and 'new barbarians.' Such statements suggest a policy which is a direct threat to academic freedom and autonomy.

"Academic life must be protected from both external and internal assaults. Having affirmed that the initiative in that protection must rest with properly constituted academic authorities, the Annual Meeting states its conviction that the present tragic season in our intellectual life must not be made the occasion for premature or punitive intervention by public officials or law enforcement officers. It calls upon administrative officers, faculty members, and students to exercise their obligations affirmatively so as to insure maintenance of institutional autonomy, academic order, and academic freedom."

Other resolutions adopted at the 1969 meeting indicated how extreme were the liberal bias of the AAUP and the seeming anxiety of the groups to endorse every program of current interest to the Left: "[The AAUP] asserts the absolute necessity of examining and re-establishing priorities in the nation's social policy. The Annual Meeting recognizes that the war in Viet Nam has been a major factor in the dislocation of those priorities, and it therefore welcomes any efforts to bring the war to an end. Unrest on American campuses is unlikely to subside as long as students are faced with the prospect of being drafted for a highly questionable war. Funds for quality education in the United States are constricted while war and defense demand so much of the national tax dollar . . . . [The AAUP urges] rapid U.S. withdrawal from South Viet Nam. The restoration of peace will permit the government and people of the United States, freed from the profoundly divisive effects of that conflict, to commit themselves with new vigor and resolve to our pressing social needs, including those of higher education . . . . [The AAUP] urges the President and the Congress not to commit huge sums for such programs as space exploration, the development of an antiballistic missile system, or expanded defense programs until these programs have been evaluated in comparison with current and projected domestic needs and the capacity of other levels of government to contribute to meeting those needs."

The AAUP called for state and federal funds for "disadvantaged students" and "minority groups." The AAUP called for an expansion of ethnic studies programs and for a re-evaluation of ROTC programs, and reaffirmed early resolutions concerning research contracts, visiting speakers on campus, and "the confidentiality of student records."

On May 5, 1970, in the aftermath of the Kent State University riots and the death of four Kent State students, the president (Sanford Kadish) and general secretary (Bertram Davis) of the AAUP issued a statement which echoed the bleeding-heart liberals in the press and elsewhere: "We believe that the entire academic community will join us in expressing profound shock and horror at the deaths of four Kent State University students yesterday and the wounding of a dozen others.

"It is a tragic consequence of the prolonged military violence in Southeast Asia that there should be an increase in all forms of violence in this country.

"Now the decision to extend the war into Cambodia has precipitated a new crisis and widened the gap between many Americans and their country's policymakers. A continuation of the present policy abroad threatens the life of American colleges and universities and can lead only to further violence and frustration at home and to the unprecedented alienation of our younger generation.

"The dangers to the fabric of American society posed by this course seem to us self-evident. We therefore call upon the Adminstration and Congress to attend to the need for prompt disengagement from the war in Southeast Asia and to give renewed attention to the mounting and pressing social problems which beset us.

"For our part, we accept the responsibility to report to this country and to the academic community on these circumstances."

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

COUNCILS FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN
INTERNATIONAL LABOR DEFENSE
INTERNATIONAL RED AID

In 1920, in the official journal of the Communist Labor Party of America, *Communist Labor,* it was stated: "The National Executive Committee of the Communist Labor Party advises all its members, whatever nationality, to oppose deportation with all means at their command. No matter how anxious you may be to return to your native land, no matter how bitter your experiences here under this bourgeois 'democracy.' The Communist Labor Party asks you to remain here as long as possible to help with the propaganda of the principles of Communism . . . .

"We do not oppose deportation on the ground that it is a 'violation of the principles of this republic.' We do not inveigh against it as being 'contrary to American traditions.' We do not plead with the master-class of this land for our 'rights.' We know that for the workers democracy is a delusion in bourgeois America and that the workers have no rights except those which they can enforce.

"But we hold it to be the duty of every Communist to help with the struggle as best he may where most needed. In Soviet Russia Communism is now triumphant. The few hundred 'comrades' that the American Government is now proposing to deport would not be of any great help there. They are not now needed there, but during this present crisis their help is sorely needed here.

"It is the duty of every one to get out on bail as quickly as he can, and then to remain as long as he can in the ranks of the Communist Labor Party as an active worker to hasten the triumph of Communism in the United States."

When the Communists received their instructions to fight deportation, the Communist Party in the United States was greatly dependent upon immigrant revolutionaries and emissaries sent from the Kremlin. These aliens came to and departed from the United States using aliases and fraudulent papers.

In 1922, the Communist International established the International Red Aid as a worldwide organization to promote Communist immigration and nationality policies. Between 1922 and 1932, the International Red Aid had 67 national sections (beyond the Soviet Union) with a membership in excess of three million.

In 1923, the Communist Party of the United States established Councils for the Protection of Foreign Born to make it easier for the immigrant revolutionaries to enter the United States. At the same time, the Councils were organized to fight the United States government's efforts to denaturalize or deport alien Communists who were already in the United States.

In 1925, the Communist Party in the United States established an American section of the International Red Aid, the International Labor Defense. And, the International Labor Defense assumed direction of the Councils for Protection of Foreign Born.

By 1932 and 1933, the International Labor Defense was so widely known as an arm of the Communist International that the Councils were discarded in favor of a new organization, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The first executive secretary of the ACPFB was Dwight Morgan, who served in office from 1933 until 1939. (Irving Novick was Morgan's successor, and Novick was followed by Abner Green [1941-1959]). Roger Baldwin, the head of the American Civil Liberties Union, was instrumental in the recruitment of members and sponsors of the ACPFB.

In the 1930's the officers, members, and sponsors of the ACPFB included some of the most notorious leftists in the nation: Louis Adamic, Sherwood Anderson, Harry Elmer Barnes, Franz Boas, Louis Bromfield, Van Wyck Brooks, Heywood Broun, Henry Seidel Canby, Winifred L. Chappell, George S. Counts, Henry Hitt Crane, Jerome Davis, John Dewey, Waldo Frank, Ralph Harlow, Granville Hicks, John

Haynes Holmes, Rockwell Kent, Carol Weiss King, Robert Morss Lovett, Helen Merrill Lynd, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Jack R. McMichael, Harry Overstreet, Herman Reissig, Upton Sinclair, Bernhard J. Stern, Oswald Garrison Villard, and William Carlos Williams. In the Congress of the United States, Emanuel Celler and Vito Marcantonio were the most vocal sympathizers of the ACPFB.

At the Communist Party's convention in 1938, the comrades resolved: "That we support the program of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born which fights to win full and equal rights for the foreign born in the United States."

At its 1940 Conference, the ACPFB announced: "The purpose of the ACPFB shall be to perpetuate for the foreign born the fundamental American concepts of equality regardless of race, color, nationality, creed or place of birth, and to preserve the fundamental American ideals of liberty and hospitality which serve as guarantees of democracy to all Americans.

"The work of the American Committee shall be to promote better relations and understanding between native and foreign born by means of education; to encourage and facilitate naturalization of non-citizens; to prevent discrimination against non-citizens or foreign-born citizens because of their nationality, political, economic or religious belief, or lack of citizenship; to prevent the destruction of American families by the threat of deportation; to maintain the traditional right of asylum for political and religious refugees in the United States; and to actively work for the solution of the problems confronting the foreign born in the United States.

"The American Committee shall be a non-partisan body, cooperating with all other organizations interested in any phase or phases of its program."

At the 1940 conference, the Communist-created and Communist-controlled ACPFB received one of its biggest boosts when President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent his greetings to the conferees. It was truly a star-studded gathering. Co-chairmen of the conference were Ernest Hemingway and President William Allan Neilson of Smith College. Archibald MacLeish read one of his poems and U.S. Senator Claude Pepper delivered a major address to the conference. At the time, there was no denying the Communist nature of the ACPFB. During the conference proceedings, the delegates voted *down* a resolution that the ACPFB was "devoted to the cause of pure democracy and opposed to forces of totalitarians of all kinds as being essentially undemocratic." (Louise Pettibone Smith of Wellesley College, one of the ACPFB's most energetic workers, wrote of the 1940 conference in her *Torch of Liberty* [a 25-year history of the ACPFB]: "There were undoubtedly communists and communist sympathizers at the Conference. The ACPFB has never rejected cooperation on the ground of political opinion.") (Leonard Patterson, a former Communist, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, explained: "That committee [ACPFB] . . . was considered by the Communist Party as a transmission belt. It was a committee that could appeal to the foreign-born people in the United States and properly claim to be their protector as a means of rallying the foreign born in the unions and in the mills and in the factories into the Communist Party. However, there was another reason, so far as the protection of the foreign born was concerned. The overwhelming majority of the Communist Party membership at the time I was in there were foreign-born people, and most of them were not naturalized. Therefore, by creating a committee for the protection of the foreign born, the Communist Party was trying to work to safeguard its own membership, so it had two purposes.")

In 1942, the ACPFB held its conference in Cleveland where it was welcomed by Mayor – later U.S. Senator – Frank Lausche. And again the conferees received greetings from President Roosevelt. In 1943, the conferees received greetings from Secretary of State Cordell Hull and Massachusetts' Governor Leverett Saltonstall.

In 1943, the ACPFB summarized its history since it had undergone the change of name in 1933: "In that decade, the ACPFB had handled 4,520 applications for citizenship; 3,542 cases to regularize the status of foreign born in order to prevent the separation of families; 3,814 cases of citizenship problems; 768 immigration problems; 524 cases of political or religious refugees; for naturalized and non-citizens, 2,006 cases of discrimination in employment; 2,574 problems of status and similar difficulties; 1,461 miscellaneous problems of relatives of foreign born. It had distributed over five million copies of pamphlets [one ACPFB pamphlet was written by Earl G. Harrison, who later became a member of the President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization]; had issued about 240 different leaflets on special problems; had conducted 62 radio programs. It had held eight national conferences and twenty-seven regional conferences. It had participated in 26 public hearings before Congressional committees. It had furnished special material to periodicals, newspapers and radio commentators. It had initiated observances of Statue of Liberty Day and had inspired the national celebration of 'Americans All' Week." – Louise Pettibone Smith, *Torch of Liberty,* p. 166. (In 1941, when ACPFB first proclaimed "Americans All" Week, sponsors included Albert Einstein, President Daniel Marsh of Boston University, Eleanor Roosevelt, Congressman Adolph Sabath of Illinois, and Tacoma's Mayor Harry Cain. Cain later became a U.S. Senator and, from 1953 until 1956, was a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.)

From 1941 until his death in 1959, Abner Green – as executive secretary – directed the affairs of the ACPFB. At the same time, he was a member of the Communist Party's nationality commission. From 1942 until her death in 1952, Carol Weiss King was the general counsel for the ACPFB. She was one of the most accomplished Communist attorneys. She was secretary of the Communist Party's International Juridical Association and a charter member of the Communist Party's National Lawyers Guild. Other Communists who worked actively in the ACPFB included: Victor Arnautoff, Harriet Barron, Elmer Benson, Anita Block, Frank Borich, Tillie Carle, Haakon Chevalier, Hugh De Lacy, W.E.B. DuBois, Isidore Englander, Stephen Fritchman, Hugo Gellert, Louis Goldblatt, Ralph H. Grundlach, Dashiell Hammett, Pearl Hart, Donald Henderson, Paul Jarrico, Alec Jones, Albert Maltz, Thomas Mann, Carl Marzani, Lewis Merrill, George B. Murphy Jr., (who was public relations director for the National Association of Colored People at the same time he was an activist in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born) Charles Musil, Russ Nixon, Irving Novick, Stanley Nowak, William L. Patterson, George Pirinsky, Mike Quill, Reid Robertson, Joseph P. Selly, Bernhard J. Stern, Dorothy Strange, Steve Tandaric, Jeanette Turner, Harry F. Ward, and John M. Weatherwax.

At the height of its power, the ACPFB had more than three hundred state, regional, and local organizations within its complex. Some of the larger affiliates were the Eastern Pennsylvania CPFB, the Los Angeles CPFB, the Michigan CPFB, the Midwest CPFB, the Minnesota CPFB, the New England CPFB, the New York CPFB, the Northern California CPFB, the Northwest CPFB, the Ohio CPFB, the Oregon CPFB, and the Western Pennsylvania CPFB. Each and every affiliate was directed by the Communist Party to work among and on behalf of foreign-born groups, especially in immigration and nationality matters. At all times, members of the ACPFB and its affiliates were expected to create pressure for repeal of immigration and security laws and to prevent the deportation of individual Communist agents.

For their campaign of political subversion, the Communists, who were directing the ACPFB and its affiliates, recruited fellow travelers to add their prestige and energies to the cause. They were historians, political scientists, novelists, entertainers, labor leaders, poets, biographers, playwrights, scientists, members of the press, religious leaders, educationists, philosophers, foundation officials, and politicians. They included Brooks Atkinson, Emily Balch, Lee Ball, Tallulah Bankhead, Stringfellow Barr, Charles A. Beard, Mary McLeod Bethune, Algernon Black, Edwin Borchard, Frank Capra, James B. Carey, John W. Darr Jr., John Dos Passos, Will Durant, Thomas I. Emerson, Frank Graham, Fannie Hurst, Matthew Josephson, William H. Kilpatrick, Edward Lamb, Emil Lengyel, Max Lerner, Kirtley Mather, Carey McWilliams, Alexander Meiklejohn, Senator James E. Murray, Reinhold Niebuhr, Clifford Odets, Clarence Pickett, Arthur Upham Pope, A. Philip Randolph, Paul Robeson, Harold Rugg, Monsignor John A. Ryan, Frederick L. Schuman, Vida Scudder, Pete Seeger, George Seldes, Guy Emery Shipler, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, Donald Ogden Stewart, Maxwell Stewart, Dirk Struik, Curt Swinburne, Harold Urey, Thornton Wilder, and Max Yergan.

On June 25, 1942, the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities reported: "Numerous witnesses who have appeared before our committee have given testimony indicating that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a Communist-dominated front. In particular, we call attention to the testimony of Humberto Galleani who was formerly an official of the organization. Galleani testified that the Communist Party, of which he was once a member, assigned him to work in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and that there was no doubt about the party's complete control." On March 29, 1944, the House Special Committee reported: "One of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States is the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born."

Despite the two warnings by the House Special Committee, the 1945 conference of the ACPFB received greetings from U.S. Senators Joseph Guffey, Brien McMahon, James M. Mead, and Elbert Thomas; Associate Justice Hugo Black of the Supreme Court; Secretary of Labor Lewis Schwellenbach, and Secretary of Commerce Henry A. Wallace.

AMERICAN COMMITTEE FOR PROTECTION OF FOREIGN BORN

On June 1 and September 21, 1948, the Attorney General of the United States, Tom Clark, in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, cited the ACPFB as "subversive and Communist." Clark's citations, however, meant little or nothing to the fellow travelers who supported the ACPFB. In 1949, at the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("a Communist front"), seventy-one members of the ACPFB were present.

In April 1953, Attorney General Herbert Brownell petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to require the ACPFB to register as a Communist front organization. On April 23, 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported: "To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the . . . American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. When the Communist Party itself is under fire these offer a bulwark of protection."

In 1956, the House Committee on Un-American Activities held extensive hearings on the ACPFB. The Committee found the ACPFB to be "the oldest creation of the Communist Party still active in the United States . . . [under] complete domination by the Communist Party . . . [with the] goal of using the political freedom of the United States for the sole purpose of destroying that freedom." The HCUA further reported (August 16, 1957): "In its early years, the work of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and its confederate organizations consisted primarily of intervening in the cases of Communist agents who faced deportation. With the enactment of the Internal Security Act in 1950, and the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, the Communist Party and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, in turn, found it necessary to undertake a new emphasis in its work . . . . [The ACPFB] mobilized all of its resources to render ineffective the Immigration and Nationality Act and other legislation bearing upon the security of the United States."

Of paramount importance was the finding by the HCUA: "Although the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and its affiliates professed to be concerned with the plight of all foreign-born, for humane reasons, the evidence obtained by the Committee on Un-American Activities proves that the resources of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born were set into motion only on behalf of persons essential to the Communist conspiracy in the United States." (It was the experience of the HCUA and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that witnesses repeatedly invoked the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination when asked about their membership and activities in the ACPFB or their acquaintanceship with members and officials of the ACPFB.)

On June 27, 1960, the Subversive Activities Control Board ordered the ACPFB to register as a Communist front organization with the Attorney General. The SACB found: "The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is an organization within the United States consisting of a national headquarters in New York City and affiliated branches or chapters at various places throughout the country, named committees for protection of foreign born of particular localities . . . [and] the entire organization (national and locals) is effectively under the management, direction and supervision, and controlled by members and representatives, of the Communist Party." The registration order was upheld by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. But on April 26, 1965, the Supreme Court of the United States vacated the judgment of the Court of Appeals and annulled the order of the SACB. In an unsigned opinion, the Supreme Court ruled that the evidence against the ACPFB was too old and that the SACB should bring the record up to date to justify a registration order.

By 1965, the registration of the ACPFB as a Communist front was no longer of much value to anyone. Between 1923 and 1965, the ACPFB had accomplished its purposes. By 1965, the deportation of Communists was virtually an unheard-of occurrence. The immigration and naturalization laws and various internal security laws had been so weakened by new legislation and judicial fiat that they had become practically useless.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

On April 6, 1917, the United States formally entered World War I. Twenty-four days later, the American Friends Service Committee was organized in Philadelphia by fourteen members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers). "The AFSC was formed . . . to provide an alternative to Quaker youths faced with a conflict between their religious beliefs in nonviolence and demands for military service." (Elliot Carlson in the *Wall Street Journal*, November 11, 1966.)

During its first twelve years of existence, the AFSC enjoyed a widespread reputation as a commendable welfare arm of the Quakers.

"Remembering their long history of religious persecution, the Quakers naturally turned to the relief of human suffering and the protection of the humble and lowly as their bounden religious duty . . . . However, in selecting areas of work the Quakers preferred to work in those areas where human suffering and distress was caused by human agencies as distinguished from those caused by natural disasters." (Karl Baarslag in *News and Views,* May 1959.)

Welfare was not the only concern of the AFSC in the post-World War I years. "In the years following World War I, the new American Friends Service Committee began to direct its attention to programs whose purpose would be to bring about better understanding between the world's peoples and establish the foundations of peace. Quaker centers were established in cities such as Paris, Berlin, Geneva, Warsaw and Moscow. Institutes on world affairs were begun in the United States, and caravans of college students crisscrossed the country with a message of world peace." (*Quaker Service,* Spring 1967.) And, on its twenty-fifth anniversary, the AFSC said of its work: "When true to its heritage, Quaker Service goes further than charitable relief. There is a more fundamental objective than passing kindliness. Quaker Service tries to strike at the cause of social ill rather than to cover up its effects . . . . It is irrevocably opposed to violence or coercion even though the ends in view seem good." (*Twenty-five Years Under the Red and Black Star,* published in 1942 by the AFSC.)

In its literature, in recent years, the AFSC has said of itself: "The American Friends Service Committee is a Quaker organization dedicated to helping create conditions under which true peace can exist. Resting on the faith that there is that of God in every man which gives him intrinsic worth and dignity, the Committee strives to replace hatred and suspicion with imaginative action on all levels of relationship between person and person, group and group, nation and nation." – "The American Friends Service Committee attempts to relieve human suffering and to seek for nonviolent solutions to conflicts – personal, national, and international." – "The American Friends Service Committee is a corporate expression of Quaker faith and practice. It is rooted in the conviction that each human life is sacred, each man a child of God, and that love, expressed through creative action, can overcome hatred, prejudice and fear. To that end, the Committee undertakes programs of relief, service and education, ministering to both the physical and spiritual needs of men."

In 1929, the AFSC underwent reorganization. Clarence Pickett, who had been ordained to the Quaker ministry in 1913, served as executive secretary of the AFSC from 1929 until 1950. During Pickett's tenure, the AFSC became an active leftwing pressure group. For his part, Pickett combined his role as guiding genius of the AFSC with that of a fellow traveler. Among his affiliations were the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the American-Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief ("subversive and Communist"); and *Soviet Russia Today* ("Communist front publication"). He was an organizer of the leftwing, pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He was an official of the leftwing American Committee on Africa, the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the leftwing-pacifist Promoting Enduring Peace. He was affiliated with the leftwing Africa Defense and Aid Fund, the leftwing-pacifist Church Peace Mission, the leftwing Committee for a Democratic Spain, the leftwing Committee for Medical Freedom, the leftwing-pacifist Committees of Correspondence, the leftwing Common Council for American Unity, the leftwing Federation for Repeal of the Levering Act, the leftwing Highlander Folk School, the leftwing Nation Associates, and the leftwing-pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. He signed petitions on behalf of imprisoned Communists. He worked for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In the 1930's, under Pickett's leadership, the AFSC was a cooperating section of a Communist organization, the War Resisters International Council of International Anti-Militarist Groups, whose avowed purpose was to work "for the supercession of capitalism and imperialism by the establishment of a new social and international order." Also in the 1930's, the AFSC was a participating organization in the National Council for Prevention of War, a group which harbored anarchists, pacifists, Communists, and anti-anti-Communists. (In 1954, the House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations reported that the AFSC "organized the Student Peace Service Committee, which assisted in the organization of the Youth Committee against War, which brought together: the American Student Union [cited as a Communist front] ; the War Resisters League; the Fellowship of Reconciliation; the Young Peoples Socialist League; the Farmers Union; the Independent Communist Labor League; the

Methodist Federation for Social Service [Youth Section]; the American Youth Congress; and other leftwing groups." The Special Committee was concerned by the fact that the Ford Foundation had granted the AFSC "a total of $1,134,000 of the public's money," notwithstanding the AFSC's history of political activity. During its investigation of the AFSC, the Special Committee found that the AFSC "supported the pacifist Frazier Bill which would have prevented us [the United States] from waging war; and the Griffin Bill which would have prevented us from denying citizenship to those aliens who refused to take [an] oath to defend the United States. It sponsored the World Youth Congress which has been cited as a Communist front. It sent a delegate to the World Youth Festival, held in Prague in 1947, a pro-Soviet and Communist-sponsored affair. In June 1948, it circulated Congress with a statement expressing its unalterable opposition to conscription for military service." The Special Committee concluded that, when the Ford Foundation gave tax-exempt funds to the politically active AFSC, the foundation's officers "were guilty of gross negligence.")

One of the most ambitious projects of the AFSC has been its National Speaker's Service, "which arranges for persons with varied opinions" to speak at colleges, universities, civic clubs, and religious and professional organizations "to encourage examination and discussion of the critical issues which confront mankind." Invariably, the "persons with varied opinions," who have spoken under AFSC auspices, have been recruited from the Left. They have included fellow-traveler Roger Baldwin of the American Civil Liberties Union; Eugene P. Boardman, an apologist for Red China; fellow-traveler Derk Bodde; Ludwig Brecher (alias Louis Dolivet, alias Ludwig Udeanu), an agent of the Comintern; Henry Hitt Crane, a long-time fellow-traveler; David Dellinger, a draft dodger, leftwing pacifist, and Communist; Felix Greene, one of Mao Tse-tung's most celebrated propagandists; Alger Hiss (after his first perjury trial, which had resulted in a hung jury); Homer Jack, a leftwing pacifist and long-time executive secretary of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; Communist Herman Jacobs (alias Martin Hall); Owen Lattimore, a "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy"; James M. Lawson Jr., a racial agitator who served a prison term for draft evasion during the Korean War; Milton Mayer, a leftwing pacifist; Abraham J. Muste, a long-time collaborator with the Communist Party; Linus Pauling, whose "peace" activities eventually gained him the Lenin Peace Prize from the Soviet Union; Morris Rubin, editor of the ultra-leftist *Progressive* magazine; fellow-traveler and racial agitator Bayard Rustin; and Frederick Schuman, a "typical sponsor" of Communist fronts.

In its publishing and distributing endeavors, the AFSC has promoted the writings of an extraordinary representation of leftists, including: Herbert Aptheker, Tristram Coffin, Henry Steele Commager, Jerome Davis, John K. Fairbank, W.H. "Ping" Ferry, Erich Fromm, Morton Halperin, Michael Harrington, Thomas Hayden, Paul Hoffman, Russell Johnson, Martin L. King Jr., Arthur Larson, Sidney Lens, Louis Lomax, Seymour Melman, Walter Millis, Jonathan Mirsky, Lewis Mumford, Fred Warner Neal, Carl Oglesby, James Peck, Bertrand Russell, Robert Scheer, Mulford Sibley, Edgar Snow, Isidor F. Stone, Norman Thomas, John Carter Vincent, James Warburg, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn. Leftwingers who have worked closely with the AFSC include: Emily Balch, Stringfellow Barr, Stuart Chase, Harvey Cox, Hugh Hester, Freda Kirchwey, C. Wright Mills, David Riesman, Eleanor Roosevelt, and Pete Seeger.

Periodically the AFSC issues staff studies. One such, published in 1955, was entitled *Speak Truth to Power: A Quaker Search for an Alternative to Violence.* The study was a combination of extreme pacifism and defeatism in the face of the international Communist conspiracy. Included in the study was a bitter denunciation of anti-Communism, which the AFSC charged had caused since 1945 in the United States "a steady erosion of the values that were formerly considered the very foundation stones of American democracy. Spying on fellow citizens, anonymous denunciations, restrictions on freedom of movement, speech, and press, prosecution for beliefs rather than acts, the reversal of the traditional presumption of innocence until proof of guilt, the gradual militarization of our minds and our society." To improve the United States, the study recommended "conscientious refusal to take loyalty oaths, to do military service, to inform against others, or to suppress opinions." Other recommendations included the elimination of racial discrimination and religious intolerance; the improvement of housing, medical care, and prisons; the support of great "social revolutions" throughout the world; and a sharing of our "material blessings" with the rest of the world even if "our own standard of living might be seriously affected."

In *Speak Truth to Power,* the AFSC made an unequivocal plea for the United States to disarm unilaterally on the possibility "that the

Soviet Union, confronted with such a change in American behaviour, might startle us with a new response." Said the AFSC: "We should get rid of our military establishment. Various avenues might be taken to achieve this result. Many suggest that the most probable and most practical approach would be through the simple transfer of the security function to a world organization. The U.N. would assume the responsibility for defense and might well be converted in the process into a federal instrument in much the same manner as the thirteen American colonies [*sic*] substituted a federal government for the unsatisfactory Articles of Confederation."

The AFSC admitted the possibility that unilateral disarmament by the United States might fail to deter Communist aggression. But, in the face of such aggression, the AFSC had a solution: non-violent resistance – which can only be characterized as a euphemism for appeasement and/or surrender. If the United States came under the threat of a Communist invasion, the AFSC recommended: "The first necessity is non-cooperation. The population must resolutely refuse to carry out the orders of the invader. They would not operate factories to provide the invader with military supplies. They would not unload his ships. They would perform no services of any kind for him. At the same time they would try through their words and their lives to show the meaning of a free and democratic society. Second, the population must maintain good will toward the individual soldier of the invading forces. However difficult this is in practice, it is clear that the effective use of non-violent resistance has always demanded that a clear distinction be drawn between hatred of an evil policy and respect for the human instrument who is caught up in its execution. Good will is the spiritual weapon of non-violence, just as civil disobedience is its physical weapon. Finally, the population must be well enough disciplined to refrain from individual acts of violence no matter what the provocation. The whole success of the resistance depends on meeting the enemy on a level and in a manner against which he cannot retaliate effectively. He understands violence, and he is prepared to cope with it ruthlessly and drastically. He must be given no excuse to do so." The AFSC conceded that non-cooperation might not succeed, but the concession was paired with fatalism: "We have tried to make it clear that readiness to accept suffering – rather than to inflict it on others – is the essence of the non-violent life, and that we must be prepared, if called upon, to pay the ultimate price."

In June 1955, Clarence Pickett accompanied five other Quakers on a tour of the Soviet Union. From that experience, the AFSC published a booklet entitled *Meeting the Russians.* By any reasonable standards, the booklet must be considered one of the most abject apologies for Communism ever published in the United States by Americans. Eugene Lyons called *Meeting the Russians* "as cold-blooded and cynical a document as has come to my attention in many a year, and I am something of a connoisseur of the literature of pro-Soviet apologetics. I searched its 94 pages for a word of compassion for the victims of the brutal totalitarian state; a soupçon of sympathy for the millions steeped (as is evident even in this account of conditions) in wretchedness and subjected to routinized injustice; a syllable of sharp criticism of the Communist despots. In vain." ("Six Quakers in Search of Coexistence," *National Review,* September 22, 1956.)

Mr. Lyons found the report especially nauseous because it was "utterly self-righteous, invoking religion, peace and other noble values on every page." Clarence Pickett and his Quaker colleagues discerned no substantive differences between the Communist and non-Communist worlds. They viewed Communism as the "militant state religion" of the Soviet Union where the government leaders were "warrior priests" defending the "one true faith."

The most surprising feature of *Meeting the Russians* was the apologia offered by the "non-violent" Pickett and his companions for the violence perpetrated by the Soviet regime's "warrior priests" against their subject peoples: "Virtually everything in Communist conduct that shocks the moral principles of non-Communists can thus be explained in terms that are familiar and even acceptable to most non-Communists when demanded by military necessity in time of international war. The list would include systematic spying, censorship, assassinations, mass killings, the taking and killing of hostages, imprisonment without trial, the spreading of false propaganda, the deception of the enemy (whether a class or a nation) by an effective means, mass starvation, sabotage, bribery, and the use of informers and provocateurs. We need look back no further than World War II and the Korean War to find examples of all of these acts committed at one time or another by both sides – not because either side willfully preferred to engage in such acts but because both sides were forced by the logic of war to choose between engaging in these acts and risking defeat." (The apologia for the Soviet regime's violence becomes more curious in light of the fact that, in June

1955 – the month in which Pickett and his colleagues visited the Soviet Union – the AFSC proclaimed: "It is an unsound premise that Communism is the greatest evil of the day." Violence is a greater evil, according to the AFSC, which did not explain the logic behind the divorcement of Communism and violence.)

By the mid-1950's there could be no doubt that the AFSC was no longer primarily concerned with "attempts to relieve human suffering." Rather, the AFSC showed an almost total commitment to political affairs. In March 1957, Lyle Tatum, an official of the AFSC, was chairman of a forum wherein a debate was held on "What's Ahead for the American Left." Participants in the debate included representatives of the Independent Socialist League (Trotskyite), the Socialist Workers Party (Trotskyite-Communist), the Socialist Party-Social Democratic Federation (ultra-left), the Fellowship of Reconciliation (leftwing-pacifist), and the Communist Party of the USA.

In December 1957, the AFSC published its recommended program for United States foreign policy: "(1) Cancel our nuclear weapons tests. (2) Start [unilateral] disarmament by gradual steps. (3) Share our resources more fully. (4) Consider the problems of men more important than the promotion of alliances. (5) Strengthen the United Nations as an inclusive and responsible agency for peace. (6) Seek ways to bring men together across the Iron and Bamboo curtains."

In May 1959, in full-page newspaper advertisements, the AFSC presented its hysterical views of nuclear warfare: "*What else but madness* is it when we seek comfort in the calculation that one-half rather than three-fourths of our population would die in an all-out nuclear war? *What else but madness* is it when our hope for security lies in terror? *What else but madness* is it when each of two powerful countries insists that all agreements be to the sole advantage of it alone? *What else but madness* is it when we think that rearming Germany with nuclear weapons is a step toward peace?"

In 1961, the AFSC – through its lobbying arm, the Friends Committee on National Legislation – adopted as its legislative program: "*World Disarmament.* Conclusion of a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Resume negotiations leading to a treaty calling for the permanent abolition of nuclear testing. Resume General Disarmament Negotiations. Make a greater, more intensified effort to reach agreement with the Soviet Union and [Red] China on immediate next steps toward world disarmament under United Nations inspection and control.

Prevent the Transfer of Nuclear Weapons to NATO Commands . . . . *World Law.* Strengthen the International Court of Justice by removing the United States' 'self-judging' reservation ["disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States"] . *World Economic Development.* Appropriate more funds on a long-term basis for U.N. and U.S. economic aid and technical assistance programs. Strengthen and improve the 'Food for Peace' program to use America's $7 million plus surplus agricultural products more creatively. Establish an International Youth Service Corps to provide an opportunity for young men and women to serve abroad in an international program to improve living standards and increase friendship around the world." [Since 1943, when the Friends Committee on National Legislation was organized, it has lobbied on problems affecting American Indians, race relations, and "civil rights." It has worked for the benefit of the United Nations. It has promoted extremely liberal immigration laws and more liberal laws for the benefit of conscientious objectors, with concomitant efforts to oppose military training.]

Over the years, individual members and small groups of the Society of Friends (Quakers) have disavowed various projects of the AFSC.

However, in 1963, the AFSC prepared a 68-page report (*A New China Policy: Some Quaker Proposals*), which was presented as the views of the more than 125,000 Quakers in the United States. The report recommended that the United States: "Put pressure on Nationalist China to withdraw from the Quemoy and Matsu islands and to give up military threats and incursions against Communist China. Recognize Peking as the legitimate government of China. Show concern for the 'well-being' of [Red] China. End restrictions on communication and exchange with Red China. End restrictions on trade with Red China. Declare its readiness to join Red China in mutual interest projects. Pave the way for negotiations with Peking. The Quaker report said it was essential that Peking take over [Nationalist] China's seat in the U.N. It acknowledged that the existence of the Republic of China on Taiwan was the greatest political barrier." (United Press International dispatch in the *Miami Herald,* May 2, 1963.)

In 1962, the AFSC – again using the device of newspaper ads – entered the "Cuban Crisis" controversy. In its customary fashion, the AFSC placed responsibility equally on the United States and the Soviet Union: "For many years all men have lived in a world in which weapons of one sort or another have in many directions been mounted and pointed at the hearts of other men. We have expected the people of the Soviet Union to accommodate themselves to nearby nuclear-armed missiles aimed at their cities. Now we have experienced the same situation.

"We believe that the Soviet arms build-up in Cuba and United States blockade and military response dangerously increased international tensions and risked the outbreak of a full-scale thermonuclear war. We oppose such actions taken by either side.

"We support the efforts being made by both sides to ease the present Cuban crisis: halting of Soviet arms shipments and the dismantling of Soviet missile bases in Cuba, and the lifting of the United States blockade. We assert that there are additional positive steps which must be taken at this time, not only to diminish the immediate threat to this country but also to lessen the threat of war to all mankind.

"Both sides should declare their willingness to negotiate the abandonment of missile bases on foreign soil as part of a total settlement. Greater efforts should be made to achieve world-wide disarmament. In keeping with the growing concept of the oneness of mankind, all countries, including our own, should be willing to submit their differences to the United Nations, the only forum available for the orderly expression of world opinion, and agree in advance to abide by the recommendations of that body."

On the question of the Vietnam War, the AFSC has been as extreme in its opposition as any leftwing group in America. In December 1964, an AFSC newspaper advertisement, directed toward President Lyndon Johnson, carried all the then current exhortations, clichés, and canards employed by the ultra-left. The AFSC called for "an immediate cease-fire agreement in Vietnam" to end what is "fundamentally a civil war, but threatens to become an international war." – "Success of the Viet Cong guerrillas can only be attributed to aid and cover given them by a sympathetic rural population in the South." – "The total effect of our presence is to undermine the democratic forces in Vietnam and push them into the waiting hands of the Chinese." – "We cannot win a decisive military victory in Vietnam short of all-out war." – "The United States is becoming increasingly involved in military action without the American people being fairly informed." – "Our napalm bombs are now shrivelling South Vietnamese villages and villagers. There are published reports of our use of chemical poisons which defoliate their forests, destroy their crops, kill their cattle. Our artillery and machine guns are strafing the countryside in search of some guilty soul among the innocent." (Signatories to the advertisement included such well-known leftwingers as Gordon Allport, Grenville Clark, Bernard Feld, Dana McLean Greeley, Salvador Luria, Walter Muelder, Pitirim Sorokin, John Carter Vincent, and George Wald.)

In October 1966, AFSC full-page advertisements in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post,* under the heading "For Peace in Vietnam," called for an "immediate cessation of United States bombing and the beginning of a clearly stated and swiftly phased withdrawal of all American troops and weapons." The villain of the Vietnam peace, by AFSC standards, was clearly the United States. And, at the very time the advertisement appeared in the press, the AFSC announced that it was donating $6,000 to purchase medical supplies for war victims in North and South Vietnam and in areas held by the Viet Cong. (The aid was sent through the Canadian Friends Service Committee and the International Red Cross.) In December 1969, ignoring the long history of atrocities committed by Communists in Vietnam, the AFSC used the Song My affair to charge that "United States military authorities have conducted the war in Vietnam by driving the people from their homes, burning and destroying villages, widespread and indiscriminate attacks on the countryside, extensive and persistent programs to eliminate NLF village leaders, and other forms of pillage and killing." (*New York Times,* December 14, 1969.)

In 1956, the AFSC began a series of annual conferences on human rights for high school students. The meetings, attended by about 500 students yearly, have been held at Asilomar High School, near Monterey, California. In its promotional literature, the AFSC describes the annual conference as "a 2½-day intensive 'workshop in ideas' – it's a happening with an educational purpose: to provide young people an opportunity to explore some of the more serious human rights problems in the modern world with distinguished speakers who stay throughout the conference to discuss these problems on an informal person-to-person basis after their talks." Over the years, the youngsters who have attended these gatherings have been exposed to a roster of speakers recruited from the upper echelons of the ultra-left: Harry Ashmore, the ardent admirer of Ho chi Minh; Colin Bell, successor to and soul-mate of the AFSC's executive secretary, Clarence Pickett;

Ralph Bunche and Andrew Cordier from the United Nations; the Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., a pied piper for draft evaders; Associate Justice of the Supreme Court William O. Douglas; Clark Kerr, the educationist failure; the racial agitator Martin L. King Jr. and his associates, Ralph D. Abernathy, Jesse Jackson, and James Bevel; and Harold Stassen, the perennial presidential "peace" candidate.

During the 1960's, the AFSC became extremely active in racial agitation, centered on housing and public schools, and working in cooperation with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. One of AFSC's more influential leaders, Stewart Meacham, has worked hand-in-hand with Communists and others of the far left to promote anti-Vietnam War demonstrations.

BLACK PANTHERS

In October 1966, the Black Panther Party was founded in Oakland, California, by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale, who became the top officers of the party. Newton, an accomplished racial agitator, and Seale, who received a bad conduct discharge from the Air Force, met in 1961. Newton recruited Seale into the Afro-American Association. By 1965, the two men became disenchanted with the A-AA. They considered the group to be less radical and less activist than they deemed necessary for the promotion of Negroes' interests. At the time of their resignation, the A-AA was associated with the Revolutionary Action Movement, which enjoyed very sympathetic contacts with the regimes in Communist China and Communist Cuba.

When Newton and Seale organized the Panthers, they had little trouble recruiting some of the most notorious racial agitators in the country: Stokely Carmichael, James Forman, H. Rap Brown, and Eldridge Cleaver.

In their first few months, the Panthers attracted attention on the local scene in California as they openly carried guns while wearing a "uniform" of black leather jackets, black berets, black trousers, and white shirts. Some affected mustaches or beards or goatees, along with so-called Afro hair styles.

In 1967, the Panthers achieved their first nation-wide notoriety when Seale led them on an armed invasion of the California State Legislature in a demonstration against gun-control legislation. Seale, as a result of this escapade, spent five months in jail. But by that time, the

Panthers were organized. Newton was Minister of Defense; Seale, Chairman; Eldridge Cleaver and his wife, Kathleen, Minister of Information and Communications Secretary, respectively; George Murray, Minister of Education; Melvin Newton, Minister of Finance; James Forman, Minister of Foreign Affairs; H. Rap Brown, Minister of Justice; Stokely Carmichael, Prime Minister; and Emory Douglas, Minister of Culture.

The Panthers adopted as their motto: "We do not want war. We are the advocates of the abolition of war, but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun, it is necessary to pick up the gun." They described the primary objective of the Black Panther Party as "to establish revolutionary political power for black people." In explanation of their objective, they said: "The Black Panther is an armed body for carrying out the political tasks of the revolution. Especially at the present, the Black Panther Party should certainly not confine itself to only fighting; besides fighting to destroy the enemy's military strength, our Party must also shoulder such important tasks as doing propaganda among the masses, organizing the masses, arming Black people, helping them to establish revolutionary political power and setting up party organizations. The Black Panther Party defends itself with guns and force not merely for the sake of fighting but in order to conduct propaganda among the masses, organize them, arm them, and help them to establish revolutionary political power. Without these objectives, fighting loses its meaning and the Black Panther Party loses the reason for its existence."

Newton and Seale set down rules: "(1) No party member can have narcotics or weed in his possession while doing party work. (2) Any party member found shooting narcotics will be expelled from this party. (3) No Party member can be drunk while doing party work. (4) No party member will violate rules relating to office work, and general meetings of the Black Panther Party, and meetings of the Black Panther Party, anywhere. (5) No party member will point or fire a weapon unnecessarily or accidentally at anyone other than the enemy. (6) No party member can join any other army or force other than the Black Liberation Army. (7) No party member can have a weapon in his possession while drunk or loaded off narcotics or weed. (8) No party member will commit any crimes against other members of Black people at all, and cannot steal or take from the people; not even a needle and a piece of thread. (9) When arrested Black Panther Party members will give only name and address and will sign nothing. Legal first aid must be understood by all Party members. (10) The Ten Point Program and platform of the Black Panther Party must be known and understood by each Party member, including all other material of the Black Panther Party."

Along with the rules, Newton and Seale presented admonitions: "Every member of the Black Panther Party throughout this country of racist America must abide by these rules as functional members of this party. Central Committee members, Central Staffs, and Local Staffs, including all captains subordinate to either national, state or local leadership of the Black Panther Party will enforce these rules. Length of suspension or other disciplinary action necessary for violation of these rules will depend upon decisions by national, state or state area, and local committees and staffs where said rules or rules of the Black Panther Party were violated.

"Every member of the party must know these verbatim by heart. And apply them daily. Each member must report any violation of these rules to their leadership or they are counter-revolutionary and are also subjected to suspension by the Black Panther Party."

When Newton and Seale first organized the Black Panther Party, they composed a platform and program of "wants" and "beliefs." The document would prove to be one of the most restrained outpourings from the two founders: "1. We want freedom. We want power to determine the destiny of our Black Community. We believe that black people will not be free until we are able to determine our destiny.

"2. We want full employment for our people. We believe that the federal government is responsible and obligated to give every man employment or a guaranteed income. We believe that if the white American businessmen will not give full employment, then the means of production should be taken from the businessmen and placed in the community so that the people of the community can organize and employ all of its people and give a high standard of living.

"3. We want an end to the robbery by the white man of our Black Community. We believe that this racist government has robbed us and now we are demanding the overdue debt of forty acres and two mules. Forty acres and two mules was promised 100 years ago as restitution for slave labor and mass murder of black people. We will accept the payment in currency which will be distributed to our many communities. The Germans are now aiding the Jews in Israel for the genocide of the Jewish people. The Germans murdered six million Jews. The American racist has taken part in the slaughter of over fifty million black people; therefore, we feel that this is a modest demand we make.

"4. We want decent housing, fit for shelter of human beings. We believe that if the white landlords will not give decent housing to our black community, then the housing and the land should be made into cooperatives so that our community, with government aid, can build and make decent housing for its people.

"5. We want education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society. We want education that teaches us our true history and our role in the present-day society. We believe in an educational system that will give to our people a knowledge of self. If a man does not have knowledge of himself and his position in society and the world, then he has little chance to relate to anything else.

"6. We want all black men to be exempt from military service. We believe that Black people should not be forced to fight in the military service to defend a racist government that does not protect us. We will not fight and kill other people of color in the world who, like black people, are being victimized by the white racist government of America. We will protect ourselves from the force and violence of the racist police and the racist military, by whatever means necessary.

"7. We want an immediate end to Police Brutality and Murder of black people. We believe we can end police brutality in our black community by organizing black self-defense groups that are dedicated to defending our black community from racist police oppression and brutality. The Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States gives a right to bear arms. We therefore believe that all black people should arm themselves for self defense.

"8. We want freedom for all black men held in federal, state, county and city prisons and jails. We believe that all black people should be released from the many jails and prisons because they have not received a fair and impartial trial.

"9. We want all black people when brought to trial to be tried in court by a jury of their peer group or people from their black communities, as defined by the Constitution of the United States. We believe that the courts should follow the United States Constitution so that black people will receive fair trials. The 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution gives a man a right to be tried by his peer group. A peer is a person from a similar economic, social, religious, geographical, environmental, historical and racial background. To do this the court will be forced to select a jury from the black community from which the black defendant came. We have been, and are being tried by all-white juries that have no understanding of the 'average reasoning man' of the black community.

"10. We want land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice and peace. And as our major political objective, a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate, for the purpose of determining the will of black people as to their national destiny." (Their final belief was expressed by quoting the introductory passages of the American Declaration of Independence.)

On June 19, 1970, the Panthers issued a "Message to America" in Washington, D.C., which they described as "the Capitol of Babylon, World Racism, and Imperialism." The message must be one of the most hate-laden diatribes ever directed by members of any group against their nation, their government, and their fellow citizens. The message purported to be a "call for a revolutionary people's constitutional convention, to be convened by the American people, to write a new constitution that will guarantee and deliver to every American citizen the inviolable human right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness!" The authors, in effect, issued a declaration of war as they presumed to speak on behalf of "25 to 30 million strong, and we are armed." The millions included "Black people . . . other oppressed ethnic groups, the youth of America, women, young men who are slaughtered as cannon fodder in mad, avaricious wars of aggression, our neglected elderly people."

The preamble to the Panthers' "message" was loaded with terminology that resembled the worst used by racists and Communists: "As oppressed people held captive within the confines of the Fascist-Imperialist United States of America, we Black Americans take a dim view of the position that we, as a people, find ourselves in at the beginning of the 7th [*sic*] decade of the Twentieth Century.

"We find ourselves in a very dangerous world-situation. White America has always adhered to a very racist attitude in its policy towards people who have color. This has been true in the past and it is true today. We see very clearly that whereas White America has escalated its policy of repression and containment of Black people inside the United States itself, on a world scale, the United States is playing the leading role in organizing the White race against the people of the world who have a color. Resolving contradictions between White Protestants and White Catholics, between White Christians and White Jews, between White Capitalists and White Communists, between White Eastern Europeans and White Western Europeans, between White Archeo-Colonialists and White Neo-Colonialists, wherever we look, the picture is one and the same. White racist America, which domestically has adopted the policy of open fascism in order to put down the uprisings of oppressed people of color and those few Whites who take a stand against the grizzly reality of the Babylonian scene – this same White racist America has projected its domestic racist perspective onto the international scene and has organized world imperialism along racist lines. Within the domestic confines of the United States of America, we see clearly that a well-planned, calculated Fascist Genocidal Conspiracy is being implemented against our people.

"Black people within the domestic confines of the U.S.A. have reached another cross road. This is a time for the most serious decisions that we, as a people, have ever been called upon to make. The decisions that we make in our time, the actions that we take or fail to take, will determine whether we, as a people, will survive or fall victims to genocidal extermination at the hands of the Fascist Majority which the Nixon clique are rapidly mobilizing into a beastly vigilante weapon to be unleashed against us."

The Panthers could not have been more venomous in their anti-Americanism as they listed "a few of the unsavory characteristics of the U.S.A. Monster" in their preamble: "The United States of America is a barbaric organization controlled and operated by avaricious, sadistic, blood-thirsty thieves. The United States of America is the Number One exploiter and oppressor of the peoples of the whole world. The inhuman capitalistic system, which defines the core of reality of the U.S.A., is the root of the evil that has polluted the very fabric of existence within the U.S.A. Exploitation of man by man; the rule of man over man instead of the rule of the laws of Human Rights and Justice; savage wars of aggression, mass murder, genocide, and shameless slaughter of the people of the world; impudent, arrogant White Racism; and a naked, brazen attempt to perpetuate White Supremacy on a world scale – these are a few of the unsavory characteristics of the U.S.A. Monster with which we have to deal.

"We did not ask for this situation. We did not create it. And we do not prefer it but we must deal with it."

To justify their call for a constitutional convention, the Panthers resorted to highly inflammatory language as they purported to represent the conditions of Blacks in America for whom the Constitution had no relevance. They likened police presence in "ghettoes" to "those same forces that export 'Freedom and Democracy' to Korea, to Vietnam, to Africa, Asia, and Latin America." They claimed that blacks exercising freedoms of speech, press, and peaceable assembly were bombed, lynched, and massacred, and that blacks were murdered at voting polls and "savagely murdered in our sleep by policemen," otherwise known in the "message" as racist gestapo, and – in less formal Panther documents – as pigs.

In their role as self-anointed spokesmen for all blacks in America, the Panthers renounced all loyalty to the Constitution of the United States, but they were careful to stop short of advocating a violent overthrow of the government: "Black people can no longer either respect the U.S. Constitution, look to it with hope, or live under it . . . . By shoving the Constitution aside, rendering it null and void, in order to carry out fascist oppression and repression of Black people, the fascists have, by that very fact, destroyed even the false foundations of authority in this society. We live in a lawless society where racist pigs have usurped the Legislative, Judicial, and Executive branches of government and perverted them towards the prosperity of their private interests. We repudiate, most emphatically, all documents, Laws, Conventions, and Practices that allow this sorry state of affairs to exist – including the Constitution of the United States.

"For us, the case is absolutely clear: Black people have no future within the present structure of power and authority in the United States under the present Constitution. For us, also, the alternatives are absolutely clear: the present structure of power and authority in the United States must be radically changed or we, as a people, must extricate ourselves from entanglement with the United States.

"If we are to remain a part of the United States, then we must have a new Constitution that will strictly guarantee our Human Rights to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, which is promised but not delivered by the present Constitution. We shall not accept one iota less than this, our full, unblimished [*sic*] Human Rights. If this is not to be, if we cannot make a new arrangement within the United States, then we have no alternative but to declare ourselves free and independent of the United States. If it is our national destiny to follow the latter course, then we must declare ourselves into self-governing machinery, and seek the recognition of the freedom-loving nations of the world.

"The Black Panther Party fully realizes that the two roads open to us as set forth above involve monumental undertakings. But we are trapped in a monsterous [*sic*] situation that requires a monumental solution . . . .

"The hour is late and the situation is desperate. As a nation, America is now in the middle of the greatest crisis in its history. The Black Panther Party believes that the American people are capable of rising to the task which history has laid before the nation. We believe that the American people are capable of rejecting the fascist solution to the national crisis which the fascist Nixon clique, the George Wallaces, Lester Maddoxes, Ronald Reagans, Spiro Agnews, etc. hold out to the people.

"We call upon the American people to rise up, repudiate, and restrain the forces of fascism that are now rampant in the land and which are the only real obstacles standing between us and a rational resolution of the national crisis."

Advocacy of a violent overthrow of the United States government was not totally neglected. A conditional and future threat was laid down in the "message's" concluding sentences: "If the American people, as a whole, do not rise up, reverse the present course of this nation, which, if unchecked, holds out only fascist repression and genocide for Black People, then we, Black People, will be forced to respond with a form of War of Salvation that in the chaos of carrying it out and the attempt to repress it, will gut this country and utterly destroy it. Before we accept Genocide, we will inflict Total Destruction upon Babylon.

"It had best be understood, now, that the power we rely upon ultimately, as our only guarantee against Genocide at the hands of the Fascist Majority, is our strategic ability to lay this country in ruins, from the bottom to the top. If forced to resort to this guarantee, we will not hesitate to do so.

"For the Salvation, Liberation, and Freedom of our people, we will not hesitate to either kill or die!

"All Power to the People."

In the time between the organization of the Black Panther Party

(1966) and its call for a constitutional convention (1970), there was a stormy history. Panther leaders Newton, Seale, Cleaver, Hilliard, and Brown became embroiled in serious difficulties with the law. The Panthers attempted to give their group of aggressive (they discarded the concept of self-defense very early in their history) and violent adherents an intellectual justification. They quoted liberally from Mao Tse-tung, Mikhail Bakunin's *The Catechism of the Revolution,* and Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth.*

In the Panthers' edition of Bakunin's *Catechism,* Cleaver, as Minister of Information, wrote: "Read the *Catechism.* Perhaps you will find a word or phrase that will enhance your revolutionary perspective and intensify your activity . . . . Afro-American revolutionaries are fighting for national liberation – against a common enemy: White Racist Capitalism and its bastard offspring, Colonialism, Imperialism, and Neo-Colonialism . . . . It's time to intensify the Struggle. Within the black colony of Afro-America, this means a declaration of war upon the black bourgeoisie and upon the class of Big Business Men who have turned the National Liberation Struggle into Big Business. These Civil Rights Executives must be allowed one choice only: total cooperation with the forces of national liberation or facing a terrible consequence."

The Panthers' admitted reliance upon Communist literature had its reward. On May 15, 1969, readers of the Communist Party's *Daily World* were advised: "Whereas, there is developing in the country a situation with great revolutionary potential involving the working class, and

"Whereas, in many instances the driving force and leading factor in the new awakening and militancy in shops and factories throughout the country is young black workers, and

"Whereas, in cooperation with other groups, such as the League of Revolutionary Black Workers, the Black Panther Party has recently moved to organize and lead black workers in industry, and

"Whereas, we view this development as an important and positive step in the struggle to build consciousness in the working class, and

"Whereas, this activity is very much in keeping with our views that a key element in the struggle for revolutionary change is the struggle against racism in this country and the elimination of divisions of the working class (black and white),

"Therefore, be it resolved that our Party, wherever possible, join forces and initiate cooperation with the Black Panther Party in pursuit of these and other goals vital to the liberation of the black people and the victory of the working class. That we actively support the Black Panther Party in its determined effort to survive and develop. That we join in the defense of the Black Panther Party against frameups, murder and harassment."

In the theoretical journal of the Communist Party, *Political Affairs* (November 1969), William Patterson wrote: "The membership of the Communist Party should stand in the foreground in defense of the Black Panthers." Patterson's endorsement was not made without some reservations: "While conducting a dialogue with the Panthers on the differences that exist between us, this must not stand in the way of solidly supporting the efforts of the Panthers to defeat racism and bring about unity of the black and white working class. For we know that racism feeds fascism. The destruction of racism leads to a decisive defeat of fascism."

In truth, the differences Patterson found between the Panthers and the Communist Party were minimal and, for the most part, in the ideological vein. He certainly found more to praise than to criticize in the three-year history of the Panthers. He adopted the Panthers' line that they had originally organized for self-defense against "indiscriminate police violence." But, then, Patterson found the Panthers had matured in their thinking and realized that the police were only a part of the problem with which they had to contend: "Early in the process of their tremendous growth and development, the Panthers escaped from a dangerous entrapment which American imperialism's ideologists have tried to make a dominant factor in ghetto thinking. They escaped from the illusion that black freedom fighters had to go it alone, that except for a few white intellectuals they had no allies, that the police were an independent political force whose bestiality had its roots in an innate hatred of black people. The Panthers were only momentarily the victims of that line of thinking. Both the subjective and objective reasons why this illusion was accepted at all are easy to understand.

"The Panther leadership believed that the police were an independent political entity. It was not for them a terroristic arm of the 'establishment.' In their early days, they lacked practical political experience in the national liberation struggle. They had little or no understanding of the operation and structure of capitalists' society. In terms of theoretical development, they were in no position accurately to measure the dimensions of the ideological control the 'establishment' exercised over the economic, political and cultural channels of

American life; nor were they in a position to formulate an extensive program of political action. Knowledge of the class essence and scope of police brutality, the vast range of the fight against racism due to its capitalist source, had for the Panthers not yet come into focus.

"In those days the Black Panthers could not clearly discern the degree to which virulent racism had been made an inseparable part of America's national psychology. The leadership did not recognize the irreconcilable contradictions between the constitutional and inalienable human rights of black Americans and the profit system. They did not see that the liberation struggle transcended the realm of self-defense and that not education alone, but only a program of struggle, based upon the realities of the social system, could guarantee any successes in the struggle against the terror . . . .

"The illusion that separate, single-handed combat could be waged against the police, and that restrictions superimposed on the police from community forces would completely alter the status of black Americans, was the product of narrow nationalistic, ghettoized thinking. Black America was not at fault.

"In their earliest experiences at mounting an anti-police brutality self-defense movement, the Panthers learned political lessons that brought rapid, if uneven, political development.

"The bourgeoisie in the United States had no intention of permitting the Panthers, or any organized, disciplined social group, democratically to defend the lives, property, inalienable and constitutional rights of ghetto dwellers. To permit that was to lend credence to and strengthen the struggle for equality of opportunity. The bourgeoisie had no intention of permitting any challenge to its own policy of divide and rule. Police brutality was intensified. It became more indiscriminate . . . . "

Patterson then outlined what he considered the early ideological weaknesses of the Panthers. They had relied upon Mao Tse-tung but eventually saw the error of their ways and turned to Marxism-Leninism: "The Panther leadership recognized that it faced a herculean task. But the task had to be faced. It declared itself a Marxist-Leninist political party, not realizing fully that so far-reaching a declaration did not *ipso facto* bring the objective sought to fruition. The Panther leaders grasped at and embraced the doctrines of Mao Tse-tung and the present leadership of the Chinese Communist Party. They failed to realize that Mao and his supporters were all for the go-it-alone idea which experience was forcing the Panthers to repudiate. They did not recognize that Maoism was a denial of the historic role the Panthers were beginning to attribute to the working class.

"The Panthers were enraptured with the role Che Guevara was attempting to play in the countries of South America. They did not see that Marxism-Leninism taught that there was a reality far more complex than can be seen through a casual observation of events and historical differences in the development of countries. They did not see that guerrilla tactics widely applied to the United States would mean going it alone under the most adverse conditions.

"In their splendid attempt at a political leap forward, the Panther leadership did not see clearly that certain steps in ideological development could not be ignored. There were profound and fundamental reasons why the vast majority of the Communist parties of the world – including the Communist Party, U.S.A. – struggled against the political, economic and ideological stand taken by the Maoists.

"The Maoists denied the estimate of the changed world relation of forces. But it was precisely this new situation which helped to prove that blacks in the United States did not have to go it alone; they were part of the world liberation movement. In fact, they had become a vitally significant part of that world movement . . . .

"Despite organizational, political and ideological weaknesses the Black Panthers, in a remarkably short time through struggle, had displayed tremendous political growth, development and flexibility. This has to be noted. It reflects the limitless potentialities of the black liberation movement . . . . "

Patterson then engaged in some fanciful reasoning to explain the turning-point in the Panthers' history when they came to understand what the Communists had known all along: "The Black Panther Party repudiated the anti-white abstraction. It began to recognize the vital importance of the role of classes in a struggle in which class, race and nationalism were predominant factors. It recognized that the unity within the working class, between workers regardless of the color of their skin, is an imperative and historical necessity in every country and on a world scale. It launched a fight to attain that unity against the racism that permeates most of the leadership of organized labor. It rejected the position that labor is a natural foe of the black people because of 'irreconcilable racist differences.'

"The Panthers are the first black-led organization to understand the menace of anti-Communism and unqualifiedly to express opposition to it.

"A feature of the Black Panthers is that they saw emotion and courage as essential attributes of successful struggle. They have, most of all, come to realize that success in the liberation movement demands above all else an understanding of the science of social development. They have emphasized the study of the Marxist-Leninist classics as imperative. Despite grave ideological weaknesses that still remain in their political outlook, they have declared that the Black Panther Party is a Marxist-Leninist party and launched as a major slogan: 'Power to the People!' "

Patterson was especially pleased that, in 1969, Bobby Seale had called for a United Front against Fascism, a merger of black militants and white revolutionaries. This action of Seale's, according to Patterson, was inspired by the similar call made in 1935 by George Dimitrov at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. By Patterson's flattering interpretation, Seale had the perspicacity to call upon "the peace forces, the anti-poverty fighters, all progressive forces to fight against racism and for unity of the 'New Left' against fascism . . . . The conference call was in and of itself a testimonial to the political growth of the Panther leadership. It was based on a growing recognition that the defeat of American reaction demanded a signal sharpening of the struggle for unity of the country's progressive forces regardless of political affiliation, creed, color, race, or nationality. It was a recognition of the grave danger of anti-Communism." Consequently, it behooved Communists, said Patterson, to support Seale's "united front," regardless of the differences the Communist Party may have with the Panthers on the "degree of fascist development in our country."

In the September 1970 issue of *Political Affairs*, Patterson returned to the subject of the Panthers ("The Black Panther Party and the Black Liberation Struggle") and repeated his praise of their efforts. Patterson's sole substantive criticism was that the Panthers were much too pessimistic about the existence of fascism in the United States: "There are among the leaders of the Panthers those who believe that the United States is already in the throes of fascist terror; they generalize their own experiences. That is wrong. Despite the fascist-like nature of the terror from which Black nationals have suffered for a century and the fascist-like racist terror now rampant, the possibilities remain to fight openly for the completion of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and its transference into a socialist revolution. This offers irrefutable proof that this position that fascism dominates the American scene is not consistent with reality . . . .

"Propagation of the idea that fascism now exists can only weaken the struggle to destroy fascist trends and for the development of an anti-fascist coalition."

The lofty rhetoric of William Patterson and others in their analyses of the Black Panthers contrasts sharply with the language of the Panthers themselves. For example, Seale set the style for other Panthers by calling policemen and other law enforcement authorities "pigs." Black policemen were "black pigs." Black leaders of other groups were "black racists" or "black cultural nationalists." Law enforcement became "repression" and "colonialism." (At a fund-raising affair in 1968, Dan Sullivan of the *New York Times* found the rhetoric of the Panthers and their supporters to be composed of "racial paranoia, political jargon, Utopian idealism, unprintable threats, gutty 'soul' talk and shrewd humor.")

Robert Bailey, in *Human Events* (September 7, 1968), commented on the type of language used in the Panthers' newspaper, *The Black Panther:* "A March 1968 issue, headlined 'Pigs Run Amok,' carries a cartoon by Panther Minister of Culture Emory Douglas depicting President Johnson, Robert Kennedy, Dean Rusk and Robert McNamara as pigs hung by the throat from a tree, with Douglas' caption: 'On Landscape Art – "It is good only when it shows the oppressor hanging from a tree by his [obscenity] neck." ' A realistic drawing by Douglas in the May issue depicts an armed Panther surrounded by his arsenal: Poor Man's Napalm – Gas and Ivory Flakes, explosives and torches. Following the assassination of Robert Kennedy, the Panther newspaper ran a drawing of Kennedy as a dead pig, photos of his Negro bodyguards described as LBJ 'bootlickers' and a flattering portrait of Sirhan Sirhan."

Newsweek reported on a speech delivered by Eldridge Cleaver in September 1968 to the San Francisco Barristers' Club, a group of young lawyers, men and women. Cleaver, whose literary "achievements" have been universally praised in the left-liberal media, said, in part: "America is up against the wall. This whole apparatus, this capitalistic system and its institutions and police . . . all need to be assigned to the garbage can of history and I don't give a **** who doesn't like it. If we can't have it, nobody's gonna have it. We'd rather provoke a situation . . . that will disrupt cities and the economy so that the enemies of America could come in and pick the gold from the teeth of those Babylonian pigs [police] . . . . We can go nowhere unless we have the right to defend ourselves against the pig cop . . . . Up against the wall, [obscenity]. You may think you're riding in luxury liners, that you can put a fool like Richard Nixon or an unconscionable man like George Wallace in the White House, but none of those pigs can solve the problem . . . . We need lawyers today who have a lawbook in one hand and a gun in the other . . . so that if he goes to court and that [obscenity] doesn't come out right, he can pull out his gun and start shooting . . . . If I could get two machine guns out of this crowd I wouldn't care if you applauded me . . . . I hope you'll take your guns and shoot judges and police." The young lawyers applauded Cleaver and one asked what whites could do to help the black man's cause. Cleaver replied: "Kill some white people or make them act in a prescribed manner."

Cleaver, of all the Panther leaders, has been the most widely quoted with his calls for violence: "We are going to fight and we will decimate this country. We will gut your industrial cities, and we will create conditions so that enemies can walk in here and pick the gold out of your [obscenity] teeth. We are going to move with Mao Tse-tung, with Ho chi Minh, with Fidel Castro . . . . " – "America the ugly . . . the hideous . . . the horrible, the torturer and murderer of mankind . . . . The successor to Nazi Germany, the No. 1 obstacle to human progress . . . . " – "[Richard Nixon is] the number one pig, the spokesman for the power structure; and as such he oinks for all his barnyard fellows." – "From now on, we niggers have got to stop killing other niggers and start killing police." – "I think the Viet Cong are 100 per cent right and the United States is 500 per cent wrong." – "Now all black people in America have become Black Panthers in spirit . . . . Now there is the gun and the bomb, dynamite and the knife, and they will be used liberally in America. America will bleed. America will suffer." – In a lecture to Xerox Company trainees: " . . . Liberate one of those [Xerox] machines . . . one of those great big ones . . . and give it to the Black Panther Party. Maybe we'll come and burn [Rochester, New York] down, or we'll go down to Xerox and blow it up."

Cleaver, despite his calls for violence and passionate anti-American diatribes, remained an idol to many. In 1968, when he became a fugitive from justice and began his trek into an exile that eventually found him in Algeria, there was immediately organized an "International Committee to Defend Cleaver." Among the notables supporting Cleaver were James Baldwin, Daniel Berrigan S.J., Leonard Boudin, Angus Cameron, Stokely Carmichael, Noam Chomsky, Ossie Davis, Maxwell Geismar, Christopher Lehman-Haupt, Dwight Macdonald, Norman Mailer, Mr. and Mrs. Burgess Meredith, Gary Merrill, Arthur Miller, Jack Newfield, George Plimpton, Richard Rovere, Robert Scheer, Susan Sontag, Harvey Swados, Kurt Vonnegut Jr., and Howard Zinn.

Cleaver's fellow Panther leaders, at times, seemed to be trying to surpass him in vehemence. *Bobby Seale*: "The whole black nation has to be put together as a black army, and we gonna walk on this nation, we are gonna walk on this power structure, and we gonna say to the whole damned government, 'Stick em up, [obscenity]. This is a holdup. We came for what's ours.' " – "Negroes in America should oust racist pigs from their communities and work for establishment of a socialist state . . . . " – "[The Black Panther Party] hates you white people." *Huey Newton*: "Every time you execute a white-racist, Gestapo cop, you are defending yourself." – "We are going to pledge troops from the Black Panther Party to the National Liberation Front."

George Murray, the Panthers' Minister of Education and a faculty member of San Francisco State College, displayed his erudition in the Cuban Communists' *Granma*: "Every time a guerrilla knocks out a U.S. soldier, that means one aggressor less against those who fight for freedom in the United States." – "The defeat of the murderers of mankind will come as soon as we create a few more Vietnams, Cubas and Detroits." Murray advised American blacks: "Arm yourselves. The only culture worth keeping is a revolutionary culture . . . . Dynamite! Black Power. Use the gun. Kill the pig everywhere."

David Hilliard, who carries the Panthers' title "chief of staff," leaves little to the imagination of his audiences: "We cannot waste time talking about community review boards because a community review board will not act as a shield for a .357 magnum bullet. We know that the only way to stop these [obscenity] is by picking up guns and killing those [obscenity] before they get a chance to kill us." – "We will kill Richard Nixon."

The Panthers have not confined their violence to rhetoric. In 1969, for example, more than 350 Panthers were arrested on criminal charges. In the last six months of 1969, Panthers killed four policemen and wounded twenty-three. Panthers have been arrested for murder, armed robbery, rape, auto and other thefts, bank holdups, purse snatching, narcotics violations, rioting, illegal possession of guns, rifles, and other weapons, kidnapping, and Selective Service violations. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has called the Panthers a "black extremist organization" of "hoodlum-type revolutionaries" and "an ever-increasing danger to our national welfare and security." Mr. Hoover said that Black Panther clashes with police are due to "intense hatred of and vindictive hysteria against local police." Mr. Hoover warned: "Let us clear away the rhetoric and confusion purposely generated to shroud the Black Panther issue and get it back into proper prospective. An organization which stockpiles illegal weapons, trains in guerrilla warfare, and seeks confrontation with law enforcement officers for the expressed purpose of killing them is certainly in violation of the law. Yet, when lawful process is applied to bring the Black Panthers under control, their cries of genocide and harassment are seemingly accepted without question." Mr. Hoover assailed prominent individuals who raised money to defend Black Panthers accused of crimes. These individuals included Mrs. Harry Belafonte, Leonard Bernstein, Mrs. Peter Duchin, Dick Gregory, Sheldon Harnick, Burton Lane, Mrs. Sidney Lumet, and Otto Preminger.

The Panthers have received support from such far-Left organizations as the National Lawyers Guild, the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the Law Center for Constitutional Rights, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Black Student Unions, the Republic of New Africa, Students for a Democratic Society, and the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund. (Supporters of the Legal Defense Fund include U.S. Senators Edward Kennedy and Edward Brooke, Boston's Mayor Kevin White, former U.S. Solicitor-General Archibald Cox, and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Elliot Richardson.) In December 1969, the Committee of Returned Volunteers (former Peace Corps members) donated $15,000 to the Panthers. Through payment of honorariums (in 1969, Panthers made 189 appearances at educational institutions), student groups and high school, college, and university administrations have added to the Panthers' coffers.

The Communist press, in the United States and abroad, has been consistently on the side of the Panthers. The liberal press has carried countless sympathetic feature stories on the Black Panther Party and its leaders. Dexter D. Eure, a columnist for the *Boston Globe,* has written that "basically, they [the Panthers] are committed to changes affecting blacks that are socially deprived." Thomas A. Johnson wrote in the *New York Times* (September 15, 1968): "The appeal of the Panthers to Negro youths is to their manhood, status, pride and the need to protect one's own." Perhaps the most romanticized treatment accorded the Panthers was that of Patrick Owens of the *Long Island Newsday,* who wrote in the *Boston Herald* (January 25, 1970): "Huey P. Newton and Bobby Seale . . . are, with all their Marxism, as American as apple pie." In a masterful bit of understatement, Owens said: "Its [the Black Panthers'] salute – the clenched and upraised fist – has totalitarian implications, as does some of their rhetoric." Owens found the Panthers to be a product of idealism and frustration: "The Panthers are, above all else, the children of the death of a dream. They grew up hearing of Martin Luther King and of nonviolent, loving roads to social justice. Many Panthers flirted briefly with professedly nonviolent black groups. But, for most of them, nonviolence had come to seem pointless as a technique and bankrupt as a philosophy even before Dr. King was assassinated by a white man in the spring of 1968."

One of the most successful ploys used by the Panthers to gain favorable publicity originated in January 1969 as a "free breakfast" program for poor Negro children. In cities across the nation, local Black Panther chapters invited children to a central meeting place where Panthers dispensed bacon, eggs, milk, cereal, and cod liver oil to the group, ranging in age from four to fourteen. The liberal and Communist press hailed the Panthers' philanthropic gesture. For example, on April 17, 1969, an Associated Press dispatch, datelined Kansas City, narrated the touching scene in a church basement where several dozen Negro children were served "a free breakfast to make sure they didn't go to school hungry." The menu was faithfully reported: "hot cereal, sausage, toast, orange juice, hot chocolate and vitamin pill." The Panther leader in charge of the program was quoted: "This is a community program. The Black Panthers are sponsoring it, but it's the people's program. And it's something the government should have instituted long ago. If they really wanted to feed kids, they could have done it." The source of the breakfast fare? The Associated Press blandly states: "The Panthers obtain food and money for the breakfasts from Negro and white business men."

Combat (July 15, 1969) described another side of the "free breakfast" program: "The Panthers claim to feed an astronomical number of children every day (10,000 in Chicago, 2,000 in Oakland and San Francisco). More accurately, the Panthers feed 400-500 children daily, nationwide, according to a *Combat* survey. The wherewithal of Panther generosity – the bacon, eggs, milk, cereal – is extracted, under not too subtle pressure, from businessmen. Panthers lounge into a store – usually a small family-owned shop – and inform the proprietor how much he is expected to 'donate.' One issue of *Black Panther* archly commented that fire had destroyed one San Francisco meat-processing plant that had failed to contribute."

Aside from the extortion methods which support the "free breakfast" program, there are other features which are equally obnoxious. The children who attend the breakfasts are given revolutionary buttons to wear, are taught Panther slogans ("Right on" – "Power to the people"), and presented with Panther literature. In San Francisco, the children were given a Black Panther coloring book. The cartoons to be colored were almost exclusively depictions of pigs, garbed as police, being shot or stabbed by Negro men, women, and children. The captions were right out of the Panthers' lexicon: "The pig is afraid of black children because they are brave warriors." – "The only good pig is a dead pig." – "This is a pig. He tries to control black people." – "The pig is running away from black people. 'Run, pig, run.' " – "Power comes through the barrel of a gun." The cartoons were the product of Mark Teemer, a Panther leader from Sacramento, whose anti-police cartoons have also been in the *Black Panther* newspaper.

In the summer of 1969, when schools were closed, the Panthers inaugurated another program to replace the "free breakfast" format. Charlayne Hunter of the *New York Times* reported on her visit to the new program – the Liberation School. She attended a combined "free breakfast"-Liberation School session in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn. There Miss Hunter heard a discussion devoted to "pigs." "*Teacher*: 'What is a pig?' *Student*: 'A pig is a low-down person who can be any color who beats us up and tells lies.' *Teacher*: 'How many types of pigs are there?' *Student*: 'Four kinds.' *Teacher*: 'Name them.' *Student*: 'The avaricious business man pig ['who may be a landlord or a store owner,' the teacher interjected], the police pig, the president pig and the National Guard pig.' The teacher then says that there is a fifth type of pig – the faceless pig. 'You see him but you don't know him,' he said. 'He's the one who comes into the street and tells people to be cool. He gets paid for snooping around.' "

Miss Hunter heard a six-year-old recite: "We want freedom and the power to determine our own destinies." Miss Hunter noted that, of the seventeen youngsters in the class, fifteen were girls. She inquired of the significance of this and was told by one of the two high-school dropout teachers: "That's a good thing. We've got to eliminate male chauvinism. We've oppressed our women more than any of the pigs and we've got to make the point now that they are our other half rather than our inferior half."

Miss Hunter found that the children were taught to obey Panther leaders. They memorized party chants: "Free Huey" – "Free All Political Prisoners." As for Eldridge Cleaver, the fugitive in exile, the teacher shouted: "Where's Eldridge?" "He's free, eating watermelon and the pigs can't touch him," came the reply, loudly and in unison. (In their syndicated column of January 14, 1970, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak reported: "Soon after the fatal shooting of two Black Panther leaders in last month's Chicago police raid, an immensely popular black entertainer – long a vocal foe of violence and extremism – privately donated $5000 to the Black Panther party. He specifically earmarked the contribution to the Panthers' much-ballyhooed breakfast-for-ghetto-children program. But it never got there. The check had no sooner been cashed than the money was sent directly to Black Panther national headquarters in Berkeley, Calif., which has a voracious appetite for cash to finance its weekly newspaper and incessant travels by party functionaries around the nation and the world.")

On December 15, 1969, a "Commission of Inquiry into the Black Panthers and Law Enforcement Officials" was formed. Charlayne Hunter reported the story in the *New York Times* (December 16, 1969): "Twenty-four private citizens, representing the fields of civil rights, law, politics and business, joined Arthur J. Goldberg and Roy Wilkins yesterday in announcing the formation of an independent commission to 'direct a searching inquiry' into clashes between the police and the Black Panthers that have resulted in the deaths of 28 Panthers since January, 1968." [The number 28 was a figment of Charles Garry's imagination. Garry, a lawyer who has spent most of his career defending Communists and is presently the Black Panther Party's lawyer, when pressed for an accounting of the 28 names, was unable to do so. Actually, in the period mentioned, ten Panthers were killed during confrontations with police, but the liberal press preferred Garry's "28" to the truth.]

The Goldberg-Wilkins commission, which announced its formation at the New York headquarters of the NAACP's Legal Defense Fund, included Julian Bond, Georgia legislator; Sam Brown, coordinator for the Vietnam Moratorium Committee; Ramsey Clark, former U.S. Attorney General, who – when in office – refused to let the Justice Department investigate black militant organizations; Congressman John Conyers of Michigan; Richard Hatcher, Negro Mayor of Gary, Indiana; Jesse Jackson, director of Operation Breadbasket; A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of the AFL-CIO; Cynthia Wedel, president of the National Council of Churches; Whitney Young, head of the Urban League; and others of similar leftwing backgrounds.

On December 28, 1969, John de J. Pemberton Jr., a member of the Goldberg-Wilkins commission and the executive secretary of the ACLU, announced that the ACLU had made a three-week survey, which was presented to the commission. The *New York Times* (December 29, 1969) carried a lengthy account of Pemberton's contribution to the "searching inquiry" that was only two weeks old: " . . . Across the country law enforcement officials are waging a drive against the black militant organization resulting in serious civil liberties violations." – "[Law enforcement] has amounted to provocative and even punitive harassment, defying the constitutional rights of Panthers to make political speeches or distribute political literature." – " . . . High national officials, by their statements and actions, have helped to create the climate of oppression and have encouraged local police to initiate the crackdowns." The ACLU report singled out Vice President Spiro Agnew for criticism because he called the Panthers "a completely irresponsible, anarchistic group of criminals."

Only a month before the Goldberg-Wilkins-ACLU congeries of bleeding-hearts were expressing their sympathetic concern for the Black Panthers, David Hilliard, the Panthers' chief of staff, had said in public: "Richard Nixon is an evil man. This is the [obscenity] that unleashed the counterinsurgent teams upon the Black Panther Party. This is the man that's responsible for all the attacks upon the Black Panther Party nationally. This is the man that sends his vicious, murderous dogs out into the black community to invade upon our Black Panther breakfast program, destroy food that we have for hungry kids and expect us to accept [obscenity] like that idly. [Obscenity] that [obscenity] man, we will kill Richard Nixon, we will kill any [obscenity] that stands in the way of our freedom. We ain't here for no [obscenity] peace, because we know that we can't have no peace because this country was built on war. And if you want peace you got to fight for it." On December 7, 1969, Douglas Miranda, chairman of Boston's Black Panther Party, told a Yale Law School audience, "We want to kill the President of the United States." On January 6, 1970, Eldridge Cleaver told a CBS interviewer that the Panthers want to "take off the head of Richard Nixon."

In the Communist Party's *Daily World* (December 18, 1969), the Party's leaders Gus Hall and Henry Winston called for Communists to give total support to the Black Panthers with "united fight-back action, including protest telegrams, vigils to protect Panther centers and support of Panther defense funds." The directives of Hall and Winston were ideal complements to the Goldberg-Wilkins efforts and precursors of the ACLU's "survey."

In December 1969, other support for the Panthers was extended by the Berkeley (California) Neighborhood Legal Services project, which was funded in the amount of $960,000 in fiscal 1970 by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The OEO satellite adopted a resolution, using the Panthers' line of police "systematic repression of the Black Panther party and the liquidation of its leadership by the government in its attempts to silence all protest against the present political order." The group, led by veteran leftwinger Carol Ruth Silver, a $15,000-a-year OEO employee, said in its resolution: "The Board of Directors of Berkeley Neighborhood Legal Services supports the Black Panther party in their efforts for liberation of the Black and all oppressed people of this country. We are frightened and angered by the concentrated attack on the Black Panther party for the 'crime' of fighting for equality, dignity and self-determination.

"The Board of Directors of the Berkeley Neighborhood Legal Services calls for an end to the systematic repression of Black liberation groups. Consistent with that end we call for: 1. The dismissal of the four-year sentence of Bobby Seale; 2. The release of Huey Newton; 3. The release of David Hilliard; 4. The arrest of the Chicago police who killed Fred Hampton and Mark Clark; 5. Amnesty for Eldridge Cleaver. [All the individuals mentioned were Black Panthers.]

"We call on all members of the community to support these demands and thereby reclaim freedom and the power to determine the destiny of all our lives."

Perhaps the most celebrated female member of the Black Panthers has been Communist Angela Davis. On August 7, 1970, three convicts attempted an escape from a San Rafael, California courtroom. Two of the convicts, an accomplice (Jonathan Jackson), and a Superior Court Judge were killed in the course of the incident. Weapons used in the escape attempt belonged to Angela Davis and were smuggled into the courtroom by Jackson, a Panther and a companion-bodyguard for Angela Davis. Huey Newton, the Panther's co-founder and Minister of Defense, hailed the would-be escapees as "true revolutionaries." Their accomplice, Jackson, Newton said "would have been my successor" in the Black Panther Party. Newton called the incident "a colossal event. It changed the whole relationship between the oppressed and the oppressor. We feel that because of the consciousness of the three comrades who were killed – who were murdered – the event was more important than what occurred at Watts or Detroit [i.e. riots]."

The most prominent Black Panther to emerge from its first four years of existence has been unquestionably Eldridge Cleaver. Cleaver has established his base of operations in Algiers, Algeria, where he heads an international staff of Panthers and directs groups organized in various foreign countries. He has established firm relationships with Al Fatah, the Arab terrorists, and the Communist regimes of North Korea and North Vietnam. In August 1970, Cleaver headed a delegation of Panthers in Hanoi to celebrate an "international day of solidarity with the black people of the United States." During his stay in Hanoi, Cleaver reaffirmed a policy which the Panthers had spelled out clearly in February 1970: "The Black Panther party stands for revolutionary solidarity with all people fighting against the forces of imperialism, capitalism, racism and fascism. Our solidarity is extended to those people who are fighting these evils at home and abroad. Because we understand that our struggle for our liberation is part of a worldwide struggle being waged by the poor and oppressed against imperialism and the world's chief imperialist, the United States of America, we – the Black Panther party – understand that the most effective way that we can aid our Vietnamese brothers and sisters is to destroy imperialism from the inside, attack it where it breeds."

CLERGY AND LAYMEN CONCERNED ABOUT VIETNAM

In December 1965, Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam (CLCV) was organized. Until 1967, the CLCV was merely a "paper" organization, with an office at the New York City headquarters of the National Council of Churches.

In 1967, the CLCV began massive mailing campaigns in what its director and executive secretary, Rev. Richard Fernandez, described as a "public education" program. The literature distributed included pieces written by Denna F. Fleming, a leftwing pacifist; Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., the tireless hack of the Left; and Martin L. King Jr., the leftwing racist agitator.

On January 31, 1967 – the second day of a three-day "mobilization" – two thousand clergymen and laymen demonstrated in front of the White House under the auspices of CLCV. Leaders of the group included John C. Bennett, president of Union Theological Seminary; Rabbi Abraham Heschel, professor at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America; Robert McAfee Brown, theology professor at Stanford University; Methodist Bishop John Wesley Lord of Washington, D.C.; Episcopal Bishop Paul Moore of Washington, D.C.; Rev. William Sloane Coffin, chaplain at Yale University; and Rev. Daniel Berrigan, S.J. – all of whom had been familiar figures in leftwing-pacifist circles.

The demonstrators presented a statement ("Vietnam – The Clergyman's Dilemma"), which was accepted by a member of the White House staff: "We confess that we should have spoken sooner and with clearer voice. But we do speak now, hoping it is not too late, adding our voice to the voice of Pope Paul, the World Council of Churches, the Synagogue Council of America, the National Council of Churches, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, and other religious bodies in urging a reappraisal of our policy in Vietnam. We sympathize with the dilemmas that face our President and Congressmen in dealing with a situation all decent men abhor. But a recognition of past mistakes does not entitle us to repeat and compound those mistakes by continuing them on an ever-widening scale."

From this polite and solicitous introduction, the CLCV's statement turned to harsh condemnation of American participation in the Vietnam War. The trite leftwing objections were trotted out: America's escalation of the war had only served to make the Communists more determined to fight; world opinion had become suspicious of America's good intentions; the United States would have difficulty forming new alliances in the world community. The CLCV found a "discrepancy between what we are told by our Government and what we discover is actually taking place" in Vietnam. The clergy who supported the statement, it said, must support those youths who decide "that they cannot condone the war by their personal involvement."

To get peace negotiations under way, the CLCV leaders suggested:

(1) The United States should tell the Communists it is ready to negotiate and does not expect to gain through diplomacy what has not been won through military action; (2) the Viet Cong's "political arm," the National Liberation Front, should be given a place at the peace table; and (3) the United Nations, the International Control Commission, and other international bodies should play a major role in arranging a truce and maintaining a post-war peace.

The CLCV leaders claimed that they were suffering "ongoing anguish" because of America's policy of military escalation and they used the familiar leftwing clichés and unsubstantiated charges to justify their claims: "This anguish is based first of all on *the immorality of the warfare in Vietnam.* We add our voice to those who protest a war in which civilian casualties are greater than military; in which whole populations are deported against their will; in which the widespread use of napalm and other explosives is killing and maiming women, children, and the aged; in which the combatants are systematically destroying the crops and production capacity of a country they profess to liberate; in which the torturing of prisoners by both sides has been a commonplace. All who believe that man is made in God's image must be horrified by such crimes committed against God and man. There is guilt on all sides in such a war as this, but the guilt is ours far more than we have courage to admit. We can only tremble at the thought that God is just."

The statement of the CLCV included two passages which would have far-reaching consequences. One passage defended draft evaders, who were not conscientious objectors in the usual sense of the term: "Many of us are called upon to counsel young men of draft age who in conscience question our presence in Vietnam. The moral dilemma they face is part and parcel of our own. Their anguish is frequently motivated by a high patriotism that forces them to challenge, often at great personal cost, policies they believe will stain their nation's honor. How can we counsel them to participate in such a war as this? When they decide that they cannot condone the war by their personal involvement, we must support them in that decision."

The second passage charged that expenditures for the Vietnam War deprived domestic programs of necessary funds – a theme that would be expanded upon by Martin L. King Jr. and eventually became the heart of the "reordering of priorities" bleat of the ultra-liberals: "At home, we find the war threatening the very goals we claim to be defending in Vietnam. Programs to help members of minority groups realize their own human dignity are jeopardized if not destroyed. A spurious type of patriotism is challenging the right of dissent and the open debate of public issues. Financial and psychological preoccupation with the war is destroying creative plans to alleviate poverty, overcome disease, extend education, replace city slums and exalt human dignity. We grieve over lost opportunities that may never be reclaimed."

In April 1967, Richard Fernandez threw the prestige of the CLCV behind the week-long Spring Mobilization Committee's anti-Vietnam War demonstration. The Communists were the principal organizing force behind the demonstrations and Martin L. King Jr. emerged as the most widely publicized participant. King had been in somewhat of a decline. He had been trying to advance his interests by blending pacifism with civil rights agitation. But he needed a new twist and consequently he decided to focus his grievances on the Vietnam War – "this most cruel and senseless war" – "illegal and unjustifiable." The poor of America "are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home and death and corruption in Vietnam." The world, said King, is "aghast at the path we have taken" as we subvert the culture of Vietnam.

On April 15, at the UN Plaza, King told the Spring Mobilization demonstrators: "We rally at the United Nations in order to affirm our support of the principles of peace, universality, equal rights, and self determination of peoples embodied in the charter and acclaimed by mankind, but violated by the United States."

In the first week of May 1967, Richard Fernandez sent a memorandum to the "constituency" of the CLCV. He proudly announced that, on April 11, Martin L. King had accepted a co-chairmanship of the CLCV: "Although Dr. King has in recent days received quite a bit of static from different segments of the American establishment with regards to his speech given [April 11] at Riverside Church in New York City (sponsored by our National Committee), we feel that it is even more important that he accepted our invitation as a National Co-chairman. It is very clear that many persons in power in this country see Dr. King as an exceedingly 'credible' person in the peace movement and have gone to great lengths to try to contain him, impugn his motives, and in many other ways, malign him. We welcome Dr. King as a co-chairman and trust that the next few months will see our working relationship becoming a lot closer."

The CLCV-sponsored speech at Riverside Church was one of the most controversial ever made by King. He charged: "We are taking black young men who have been crippled by our society and sending them 8000 miles away [to Vietnam] to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they have not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem." He called for a boycott of the war effort and advised draft-age youths to declare themselves conscientious objectors. He characterized the Vietnam War as a class war: "We are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor. Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now." He proposed that the United States government (1) conduct a total bombing cessation in North and South Vietnam; (2) declare a unilateral cease-fire; (3) curtail military build-ups in Thailand and cease interference in Laos; (4) recognize the National Liberation Front as a future participant in the government of South Vietnam; and (5) set a firm date for the removal of all foreign troops from Vietnam.

In the same "constituency" memorandum, Fernandez announced that CLCV was supporting Vietnam Summer: "You should know that our National Committee is cooperating with faculty and student groups across the country in 'Vietnam Summer.' This is an attempt to awaken the American conscience at a grass roots level on the issue of Vietnam. This summer is strategic if effective pressure is going to be brought upon the present Administration to de-escalate the war, get into a negotiating situation, and eventually see the United States' military presence in Vietnam withdrawn . . . . "

On August 12, 1967, "Vietnam Summer" placed a full-page advertisement in the Communist weekly, *National Guardian.* Martin L. King Jr. was given credit for instituting and sponsoring the movement so as to combine the "fervor of the civil rights movement with the peace movement." In the advertisement, Vietnam Summer described itself as "working with the people in the black ghettos of Cleveland, Chicago, East St. Louis, Richmond, Watts, New Haven, Milwaukee, Philadelphia and twenty other major cities . . . . We sponsor model programs of anti-war work among Mexican-Americans in Denver, Albuquerque, Los Angeles and throughout the Southwest . . . . We have community action programs going in poor white areas . . . . We have developed a 'Vietnam in the Schools' program for introducing anti-war materials into colleges and high schools in the coming school year . . . . We are co-ordinating anti-war referenda campaigns in 15 cities . . . . We support draft counseling centers in 12 cities . . . . We are building a new moral and political base, committed to ending the war so that we may redirect our resources towards establishing a truly great society."

The CLCV-sponsored Vietnam Summer was supported by such leftwing stalwarts as Carey McWilliams, Carl Oglesby, William Pepper, Robert Scheer, Benjamin Spock, and Albert Szent-Györgyi. (At the time, the CLCV's national committee included such leftwing pacifists as: Father Philip Berrigan; Rev. Eugene Carson Blake; Episcopal Bishop Daniel Corrigan; Editor Wayne Cowan of *Christianity and Crisis*; Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg; Rabbi Maurice Eisendrath, president of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Rev. Kyle Hazelden, editor of *Christian Century*; Rev. David Hunter, deputy general secretary of the National Council of Churches; Father Richard J. McSorley, S.J. of Georgetown University; Methodist Bishop James Matthews; Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago; Rev. Richard Neuhaus; Reinhold Niebuhr of Union Theological Seminary; and Rev. Ralph Sockman. Later, they were joined by Malcolm Boyd; Henry Steele Commager; Coretta King; Seymour Melman; Michael Novak; James P. Shannon, a Roman Catholic Bishop who left his See and his priesthood; and Mrs. Theodore O. Wedel.)

In 1967, the CLCV was also supporting Negotiation Now, an ad hoc committee which rallied to the side of UN Secretary General U Thant and his demands that the U.S. repair immediately to the peace table. The movement was led by John Kenneth Galbraith, Martin L. King Jr., Reinhold Niebuhr, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., Victor Reuther, and Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr.

In late summer 1967, the CLCV's Vietnam Summer movement led to participation by CLCV leaders in the first convention of the National Conference for New Politics, a classical united-front third-party movement, controlled in great part by the Communist Party. Representative John Ashbrook (R.-Ohio) discussed the convention in the House of Representatives: " . . . He [Martin L. King Jr.] attended as keynote speaker the most radical assemblage of anti-Americans ever put together, and as the *Communist Worker* approvingly and glowingly reported: 'He described vividly the racism that can praise in its history books a white Patrick Henry who sounded the call against the British redcoats while it condemns H. Rap Brown who insists that black victims of oppression in America should fight for their freedom.' Imagine that – comparing the rabble-rousers, the looters, the social misfits in America to patriots like Patrick Henry. He was further quoted as saying 'Maybe the bluecoats in the ghetto are our redcoats.' The convention, the National Conference for New Politics – NCNP – heard chantings of 'Kill Whitey, Kill Whitey' and the most revolutionary anti-American doctrine that could be imagined, and yet the August 29-September 4, 1967, confab had the supposed 'man of peace,' Mr. King, as their keynoter. It represented a major breakthrough for the Communist Party and King helped. For years, the Communists have chafed at the doctrine of separation which tended to keep them out of respectable liberal gatherings. In the 1930's the liberals worked hand in hand with the Reds but the growth of anticommunism in the Nation has brought about a change in the 1950's and 1960's. Except for the more radical groups, liberals in general have tried to keep Communists from participating in their causes and at their conventions. King has consistently worked with Communists and has helped give them a respectability they do not deserve. The NCNP in Chicago represented such a breakthrough in the Red's goal of 'non-exclusion' that they editorialized gleefully in their organ, the *Worker,* on August 22, 1967."

Not all the leaders of the CLCV attended the convention of the National Conference for New Politics. But the evolution was unmistakable: King's Riverside Church speech; Fernandez' sponsorship of Spring Mobilization; King's rabble-rousing diatribe at the UN Plaza; King's elevation to the co-chairmanship of CLCV; King's call for Vietnam Summer and CLCV's support of the movement; King's leadership of Negotiation Now and CLCV's support of that movement; and finally, the leading roles played by King and associates from CLCV in the National Conference for New Politics.

After King was murdered in 1968, the CLCV memorialized him with "A Call for a National Fast." And the text of the newspaper advertisements that announced the "Call" proved that King was the polestar for the CLCV: "Martin Luther King was a peacemaker. For him peace was no static concept signifying the absence of conflict. Rather did he seek peace that is a wholeness constructed by justice, penetrated by love and forever pursued in hope. He could not separate peace in Harlem from peace in the Mekong Delta. Hailed as a civil rights leader, he was criticized by some for 'confusing the issues' by his protest against America's bloodied course in Vietnam. But for Martin Luther King peace was indivisible . . . .

"On April 4, 1967, at 8:00 P.M. exactly one year before he died, he spoke at Riverside Church, New York City, for Clergy And Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. 'A time comes when silence is betrayal . . . . The calling to speak is often a vocation of agony, but we must speak.' He had been told that peace and civil rights should not be mixed. Those who say this, he declared, 'have not really known me, my commitments or my calling. Indeed they do not know the world in which they live.'

"As though anticipating the process of negotiation in which the United States may soon be engaged, he counselled: 'Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and nonviolence when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves.'

"He saw that the war was no accidental delinquency. 'The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit.' His conclusion on that other Fourth of April challenges us now: 'We are faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. Now let us begin. Now let us rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter – but beautiful – struggle for a new world.' . . .

"The life and witness of Martin Luther King signalled the glory of the coming of the Lord. In these days of fasting, let us together declare our pledge to keep faith with Martin Luther King by striving for the fulfillment of the vision for which he lived and died.

"What you and we do with the future, Dr. King has left for us personally to decide. As Co-Chairman of Clergy And Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, the only interfaith peace group of which he was a leader, he wanted this week's Fast vividly, clearly and dramatically to show the United States and the world that Americans care about Vietnam and nonviolence here at home. We urge you and invite you to fast with us this week."

The "Call for a National Fast," as it appeared in CLCV's literature, indicated how distorted were the views of the group. The "Call" was a clever mixture of piety, self-righteousness, high-flown rhetoric, and unsubstantiated anti-Americanisms: "We, Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, recently concluded the second of our two national assemblies directing ourselves, the religious community, and the government of the United States, to act to end the Vietnam war.

"We have ended, for our part, our silent complicity in a war that is immoral, illegal, and against our national interests. We have spoken out, we have also listened. We listen to the word of American soldiers who admit they cannot tell the people from the enemy in that land. We listen to the word of poets who warn we must prepare our people for the taste of a bitter defeat, our first. We listen to the word of courageous politicians who risk their careers to bring truthfulness home to the American people. We listen to the word of businessmen, moving for peace in Vietnam, arguing that peace is essential for our country's economic health. We listen to the word of urban specialists who study our civil disorders, document racism in America, and call for a 30-billion dollar program to end poverty, ironically the figure now expended for the prosecution of the war. We listen to the word of our poor, men and women and children denied the right to life itself, for whom America is not a dream but a nightmare. We listen to the word of police, local and national, whose stockpiling of weaponry for riot control may well turn our cities into another 'pacification' program. And we listen to the word of our young men, drifting in the prime of their lives into the machinery of war, or driven by conscience to choose jail or exile. We listen and we have ears to hear. The Word of God in our history – history which we make – slashes the soul and breaks the hardness of our hearts.

" 'Vietnam' has come home to America. It is here. It is within us. A terminal disease, a cancer rotting the body politic. It must be rooted out by the radiation of the Spirit.

"So we call a national fast to cleanse the spirit of America. We call upon the religious community to lead this fast in the period before Passover and during Holy Week, April 8, 9, and 10, 1968. We urge public assemblies to 'sanctify the fast' in local communities.

"Such a fast means a new beginning within. It is a work of love, not of merit. We shall for a long time suffer with those who have the least, among people in a land which has the most, more than enough for all. We shall dedicate ourselves anew to a covenant of turning, confessing the world, as prisoners of hope.

"As one of our spokesmen shares the passion of this hour, so do we: 'End the Vietnam war program or end America. There is no alternative.' For the right of the Vietnamese people to live is one with the right to life of the American poor people. We would celebrate the life of men as our own life, and we place ourselves against the destroyers of life."

In October 1967, CLCV issued its first major statement on conscription. To Fernandez' "constituency," the statement was offered as a draft, but the so-called draft has remained as the working policy of

CLCV. And that policy in simplistic terms was a deliberate call for wholesale law-breaking by those eligible for the draft. They were urged to evade the draft, not under the *legal* provisions for conscientious objectors, but as "sincere and meaningful objectors" who would be aided and abetted by CLCV adherents to violate the existing Selective Service Act. The first signatories to the draft-statement included: Robert McAfee Brown, Rev. William Sloane Coffin, Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn, Rabbi Abraham Heschel, and David Hunter. The draft-statement read as follows: "These are times of extraordinary confusion. We are surrounded by conflicting voices advocating diverse solutions to difficult national and international problems. Far from having all the answers, we are humbled by the complexity of events. But in the midst of confusion one thing is painfully clear: there are thousands of young Americans whose consciences forbid them to support our country's military policy by participation in the armed forces. They are now faced with a choice of either violating their consciences or being imprisoned.

"Congressional indifference to appeals for justice has convinced us that it is no longer enough to speak in defense of the rights of conscience. The time has come to act in defense of these rights. It is no longer enough to protest the injustice of the present military conscription system. The time has come to pledge active support to all who in conscience and through non-violent means decide to resist its injustice.

"We regret the misunderstanding and disorder that may be attributed to such resistance. But the fault we believe lies not with the resistance but with the injustice resisted.

"This injustice stems from the assumption that a government can both define and monitor the claims of conscience. Such an assumption is familiar and acceptable to dictatorships, but it is foreign and offensive to a democratic society.

"We deny both the right and the competence of a government to stand in judgment upon the conscience of its citizens. Yet this is precisely what our government is doing, and its incompetence at least is clear. According to the governments definition, a conscientious objector is one whose 'religious belief and training' does not include 'essentially political, philosophical, or sociological views, nor merely (a) personal code.'

"Not to believe in God may be a gross misfortune, but not automatically an ethical default. It is absurd to claim that a man must be a believer in order to be conscientious. Further, since conscience is by definition a matter of personal conviction it is meaningless to exclude a personal moral code as a basis for 'sincere and meaningful' objection. Neither can political views be excluded. Ethical decisions must be made in relation to particular events. Therefore the citizen whose conscience forbids him to participate in a particular war is as deserving of respect as a citizen whose conscience forbids him to participate in any war.

"This is a long-standing Jewish and Christian tradition. Yet the tradition we honor is not honored by our government. This fact alone should make it clear that our civil disobedience is a form of religious obedience.

"Our concern, however, is not for our religious heritage only; it is for our democracy as well. Claims of conscience have always been troublesome to governments. Man's conscience is by nature restless and independent. It cannot be chained by government regulations any more than by religious or ideological edicts. The forces of tyranny have always, and with good reason, feared the expressions of conscience and sought to suppress them.

"In a democratic society, however, in matters of conscience a government should have recourse to persuasion, not to coercion. The present Selective Service system simply does not do this and is therefore not worthy of our democracy. It represents a substitution of force for reason, an effort to obtain obedience without assent. So for both patriotic and religious reasons we are now forced to the defense of those who wish to resist the encroachment of government upon the sanctity of conscience.

"The Selective Service Act asserts that anyone 'who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces . . . shall be liable to imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of ten thousand dollars or both.'

"We hereby publicly counsel all who in conscience cannot today serve in the armed forces to refuse such service by non-violent means. We pledge ourselves to aid and abet them in any way we can. This means that if they are now arrested for failing to comply with a law that violates their consciences we too must be arrested, for in the sight of that law we are now as guilty as they.

"When true to their tradition churches and synagogues have always been sanctuaries for conscience. We therefore call upon our fellow clergy and laymen to sign this statement, to set up draft counselling centers, to do everything possible in their communities for these conscientious objectors, and to be prepared to pay whatever price may be exacted to defend the rights of conscience our government refuses to honor. As clergy and laymen we could live neither with ourselves nor with our God if today we did not keep faith with those who refuse to surrender their consciences to the State."

The anti-draft activities of the CLCV have become the most widely known aspects of the group's program. This has been due in great part to the highly publicized trial of CLCV leaders Benjamin Spock and William Sloane Coffin, who were charged with conspiring to counsel young men to evade the draft. They were convicted, but were eventually acquitted after appealing to the Supreme Court of the United States. Another CLCV leader, Philip Berrigan, was convicted and sentenced to a federal penitentiary for destroying draft records.

In August 1968, the CLCV began circulating a petition to the U.S. government to grant amnesty to all imprisoned draft evaders, to all deserters from the armed forces, and to those draft evaders who emigrated to Canada. At the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Rev. John Neuhaus of the CLCV's steering committee testified before the Democratic Platform Committee and urged that the Democrats support amnesty.

In October 1968, fourteen CLCV representatives traveled to Paris and Stockholm for meetings with American servicemen who had deserted the armed forces. The group included John Cogley from the radical leftist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions; Harvey Cox from Harvard University's Divinity School, famous for his "situation ethics" philosophy; Father David Gracey from the staff of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania; Rev. Richard Neuhaus; Michael Novak, an ultra-liberal Catholic author from Old Westbury College; Grace Paley from the faculty of Sarah Lawrence College; Franz Schurmann from the University of California; and Joseph Sax from the University of Michigan's Law School.

Out of the European trip a CLCV mission to Stockholm developed. It was described in the April 1, 1969 *Issues and Actions,* the CLCV's newsletter: "One of the highlights of the recent Washington Mobilization of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam was the installation of the Rev. Thomas Lee Hayes as the organization's worker among deserters exiled in Sweden. In a short ceremony on the steps of the Justice Department, Mrs. Coretta Scott King and Rabbi Abraham Heschel, both Co-Chairmen of CLCV, and the Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, a member of its Steering Committee, placed their hands on Father Hayes and commissioned him for his work. Following this, Father Hayes led the more than 1200 participants in repeating a pledge dedicating themselves to this 'ministry of reconciliation.' In this way, broad-based support for what Father Hayes will be doing in Sweden was dramatically symbolized. In addition, amnesty for all Vietnam war resisters was made an integral part of this same 'ministry of reconciliation.'

"On March 20th, Father Hayes, his wife Janet, and their two children, Sharon and Jennifer, left New York City for Stockholm. Since his first several days in Sweden were spent in getting his family settled and arranging for housing, he did not begin his actual work among the more than 225 deserters until April 1st.

"The 36-year-old Episcopal minister was educated at Oberlin College where he earned an A.B. degree in psychology. He studied theology at the Episcopal Theological School and Harvard Divinity School, receiving the S.T.B. degree in 1957. In addition, he did graduate work in Psychology at the University of Iowa and theological studies at Bexley Hall, Kenyon College. Since 1966, Father Hayes has been Executive Director of the Episcopal Peace Fellowship, a national organization based in New York City. Previously, he had been a parish minister in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Elyria, Ohio. While in Pittsburgh, he directed Social Action for the Episcopal Diocese of Pittsburgh and helped found the local organization of CLCV.

"Father Hayes sees his work having three related functions. First he will serve as a 'bridge' between the deserters and their families in the United States. He will assist with communication across the Atlantic and attempt to interpret the deserters' situation to their families and to American society in general. In addition, he will interpret the reactions of families and American society to the deserters themselves. Second, he will assist the deserters with the problems of day-to-day living in Sweden. The men have difficulties with housing, money, work, and language as well as with Swedish government agencies and representatives of the U.S. Government. Because of the fact that he will hold a valid passport and not merely the temporary pass which the deserters obtain, he will be in a better position [to] be of considerable assistance to the men. Further, he will surely develop positive relations with the

Church of Sweden and other religious bodies which will add to his ability to negotiate problems that arise. Third, he will serve as a pastoral counsellor to the deserters, helping with the personal problems of the individual men. In addition, he will endeavor to build a sense of community among the deserters who at present are considerably divided by political factions.

"It is interesting to note that Father Hayes' work will be somewhat the reverse of the more avant-garde understanding of ministry prevalent in American Protestantism, which places a high priority on structural change as distinguished from a more individualistic ministry. Father Hayes will be working directly with people and will, on a daily basis, be giving of himself primarily as an individual in being a pastor to the deserters.

"The decision to place Father Hayes in Sweden grew directly out of the fact-finding trip to Stockholm and Paris in October, 1968, by several members of CLCV's National Committee. Their primary recommendation, based on the express desire of some of the deserters themselves, was that a worker be sent to Sweden as soon as possible. The work of Father Hayes is viewed by the Steering Committee as part of the task of the religious community as well as that of the peace movement generally. It would be misleading if the work among deserters were seen in isolation from the other interests of CLCV. For this reason, Father Hayes' presence in Stockholm will be of significant value as CLCV, other peace groups, and individuals not heretofore identified with the peace movement press for amnesty for all those who have resisted the draft and are imprisoned or in self-imposed exile and those who have been forced to desert the Armed Forces because of the war in Vietnam. To care for deserters while the war continues and then to forget them when the shooting stops would create a significant human casualty which would be unfortunate. For this reason, the work for amnesty is only just beginning."

Along with its mission to deserters in Stockholm, the CLCV reported in its *Issues and Actions* (May 1, 1969) that it was harboring deserters and wanted to recruit others who would do so in the United States: "Due to CLCV's long-standing visibility in supporting draft resisters and recently in sending Thomas Lee Hayes to Sweden to work among deserters, the organization has several times within the last year been asked to perform a unique and vitally important function. There are many men who, for a variety of reasons, find themselves in the military and discover that they are conscientiously opposed to all war or to the Vietnam war in particular. Unable to secure a discharge from the military as a C.O. (there is a provision for such discharges), they have deserted rather than abandon their convictions. Some go into exile in Canada or Sweden. There is, however, a considerable number for whom exile is not an option. They wish to remain in the United States and at the same time do some form of meaningful work – to make some sort of social contribution here. The only course available to such men is to go 'underground'; to go to a place where they are not known and there assume a new identity. CLCV has assisted several men recently in finding such a place to live and work. Each time the need has arisen a place has been found within a reasonable period of time. But to be prepared to help deserters quickly, CLCV would like to know persons around the country who would be willing to help such a person or persons. If you are willing to perform this service to these victims of the Vietnam war and are in a situation which would lend itself to providing a place to live and work with reasonable anonymity, please contact the national CLCV office by mail. Also, if you know of someone in need of such a place to live and work, feel free to contact us."

On December 10, 1969, a dispatch in the *New York Times* said: "A drive to raise money for American deserters and draft resisters in Canada was opened yesterday . . . by Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam and is the first such effort to date by any group involved in aiding men who refuse military service, according to Keith Watson, an official of the four-year-old organization. A statement issued at a news conference yesterday described the effort as an 'affirmative act of solidarity with men whose high sense of patriotism would not allow them to participate in the Vietnam war.' 'We are making a symbolic contribution,' said Dr. Harvey Cox, the Harvard theologian . . . . Also appearing at the conference were the Rev. John C. Bennett, president of the Union Theological Seminary; the Right Rev. Daniel Corrigan, an Episcopal bishop, and the organization's director, the Rev. Richard R. Fernandez."

On December 19, 1969, the Associated Press reported: "Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam, an anti-war group, handed over more than $5,000 yesterday to support American deserters and draft evaders living in Canada . . . . A counselor for the Toronto Antidraft Union estimated that more than 60,000 Americans of draft age were living in Canada . . . . Detroit and Boston groups handed over funds to Canadian antiwar groups Wednesday. A Seattle group will take gifts and money to Vancouver today . . . . The Clergy and Laymen group, in a statement released in New York, said that $500 in gifts would go to centers aiding draft-age emigrants in Vancouver, Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal and that the rest of the money would go to the Canadian Council of Churches for distribution to other anti-draft refugees. Other funds will go to American deserters living in Stockholm, Sweden, a spokesman said . . . .

"United States Attorney James Brickley said in Detroit he had asked the Federal Bureau of Investigation to collect information about [the transactions] . . . . He said it was illegal to aid or abet persons who violate Selective Service laws."

On the eve of the 1968 election, the CLCV held a Vietnam Sunday, with services and demonstrations to indicate opposition to the Vietnam War. In a paper ("The Religious Community and American Politics"), prepared for Vietnam Sunday, the CLCV returned to the theme that the Vietnam War was a class war. And there was a highly critical appraisal of the American people and their society: "The mood of the country, meanwhile, is made uglier by the frustrating war, and serious work at home goes undone. Billions of dollars so desperately needed at home for domestic rebuilding are simply not available. The benefits of government taxes redound upon the wealthy and the middle class – in roads, automobiles, airports, splendid suburban schools, new colleges, and the industries of war and space. Our government meets the needs of wealthy farmers, industrialists, and the dwellers in the suburbs. The cities and the poor seem systematically excluded. They can wait no longer. But at the moment, the energies of countless talented Americans – and over half a million young men – are turned towards Vietnam. The protests and demonstrations against the war have frightened millions of Americans. They do not understand the new mood and the new sensibilities of the young – their long hair, their dress, their music, their dislike of the competitive, self-denying ethic of an older generation.

"Meanwhile, many members of the white lower middle class – the factory workers, the cab drivers, the police and firemen, the laborers – feel threatened from two sides. On the one hand, their own training is affronted by the new morality of the young; on the other hand, their own prestige and property seem vulnerable before the resolute, determined protests of the non-white poor. The insecurity of this lower middle class is a volatile, violent factor in the future of our nation. Millions of members of this class have risen from poverty only in the last generation. They were aided by the very social programs which many are trying, now, to extend in new forms to the next wave of the poor.

"Class conflicts, in brief, have been sharpened by the war and by the unrest the war has fomented. Some Americans have been so enraged by a cry for peace that they have punched demonstrators in the face; others have been so outraged by support for the war that they have thrown rocks or disrupted speeches.

"The fruits of this war are division and inward strife. That is why we are sad in the autumn of 1968, and all the more sad because the presidential candidates speak so seldom of the root of our discontent, and they offer superficial remedies that will not even cure its symptoms.

"The people of the United States are fond of imagining a world threatened by a spreading red menace. We do not see that in the last thirty years our own influence, not always on the side of justice and liberty, has spread more rapidly and more extensively than that of any single world power. Our technology, our markets, our system of education, our military-industrial complex have, at almost a geometric rate, drawn a web of economic and political power toward our land. This is the reason that our complicity in every day's evil is beyond any experience in our past.

"We do not raise our voices in vindictiveness or bitterness. We only wish to see our nation as it is – to face the shattering truth. We are no longer innocent, as we thought. We have been awakened. The plague is not in alien institutions, but in our own. We must remake them or we perish. Through concerted political creativity the nightmare in which we walk must be dissipated. In the past, our forefathers devised institutions to meet the needs of justice and liberty and brotherhood; no less must we.

"The leaves are falling from the trees. Many of our brothers are in pain. The winter comes. Take heart! Ahead, awaits another spring."

In February 1969, the CLCV conducted the Washington (D.C.) Mobilization. The theme of the demonstration was "Vietnam and the Future of the American Empire." In its position paper, the CLCV said: "Specifically, we believe that the Washington Mobilization should focus on the whole question of American intervention and 'Empire Building' in other parts of the world. *It will not do,* in our view, for the American military machine and foreign policy makers to simply learn how to carry on guerilla wars in other parts of the world in a more efficient way and with less public outcry from home. *It will not do* simply for the military to have perfected its weaponry and guerilla tactics so as to be able to enter into other developing nations in a more formidable way. That we have begun to involve American Green Berets in many countries of Latin America as well as to drop napalm there is clearly an indication that the Vietnam war has – to many of our policy makers – *not* been an *object* lesson; rather, it has been a source of information to enable this country to carry on 'better' wars of repression against revolutionary forces.

"In addition to protesting the continuation of the Vietnam war, and learning more about our history of intervention in other countries, we need to take a new step in developing our understanding of an area we have here-to-fore paid little attention. If we are going to be persuasive in arguing for new foreign policy, we must be able to discuss with the same degree of sophistication, what makes our economic military machine go, and what makes our essentially backward priority system function. A new direction in American priorities in the 1970s will not be forthcoming unless we begin to learn *now* some of the specific theories and facts upon which a new economic understanding can and should be based. If new economic policy is to be effected, it can only be through significant and relentless public pressure.

"A final reason for going to Washington is to begin to press for the end of the draft in the United States. Young men are presently in jail in this country, or in self-exile in Canada and in Sweden, as a result of their resistance to conscription or to the Vietnam war after their induction into the Armed Forces. Many clergymen and laymen around the country have identified themselves with those who – for the sake of conscience – have stood their ground against the state and refused to fight in Vietnam. As the war appears to be slowly coming to an end, it seems to us we must press in a more concrete and specific way for the end of the military conscription system itself.

"To a growing concern for ending the draft is added the important issue of amnesty. In Washington we will discuss specific proposals to persuade President-elect Nixon to grant an amnesty for all those who have refused to fight in Vietnam."

CLCV was not content with conducting demonstrations in Washington, D.C. Less publicized demonstrations were held at local draft centers. In 1968 and 1969, the CLCV disrupted stockholders' meetings of the Dow Chemical Company. The CLCV participated in draft card burnings, in Hiroshima Day memorials, and in the public reading of names of servicemen killed in Vietnam.

Throughout its brief history, the CLCV has been wedded to the far Left. It has collaborated with such far left organizations as the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the New England Committee for Nonviolent Action; the National Liturgical Conference; the Vietnam Moratorium; the Fellowship of Reconciliation; the New Mobilization Committee; the National Council to Repeal the Draft; the American Friends Service Committee; the Episcopal Peace Fellowship; the National Council of Churches; and the Catholic Peace Fellowship. In July 1968, Rev. Richard R. Fernandez, director of the CLCV, journeyed to Paris in company with some of America's leading radicals. There he met with the head of North Vietnam's delegation to the Paris peace talks. He also met with members of the National Liberation Front.

In the promotion of its program, the CLCV has had as its literary heroes Richard J. Barnet, Robert McAfee Brown, James Cameron, Noam Chomsky, James Douglass, James Finn, Carlos Fuentes, J. Gerassi, Seymour Hersh, Rabbi Abraham Heschel, David Horowitz, Jean Lacouture, Sidney Lens, Louis Lomax, Thomas Merton, Gunnar Myrdal, Michael Novak, Carl Oglesby, James Reston, David Schoenbrun, Richard Shaull, Robert Sherrill, Susan Sontag, John Swomley, Arnold Toynbee, Arlo Tatum, Joseph S. Tuchinsky, and R.W. Van Alstyne.

The CLCV's political heroes have included most of America's prominent doves: Ralph Abernathy, George D. Aiken, Frank Church, Joseph Clark, John Sherman Cooper, Robert Drinan, S.J., Jules Feiffer, J. William Fulbright, John Kenneth Galbraith, James M. Gavin, Albert Gore, Ernest Gruening, Mark Hatfield, Hugh Hester, Emmet Hughes, George Kennan, Edward M. Kennedy, George McGovern, Mike Mansfield, Wayne Morse, Gaylord Nelson, Claiborne Pell, Charles Percy, Jeannette Rankin, Edwin O. Reischauer, Theodore Sorensen, U Thant, and Arthur Waskow.

For prestigious support and encouragement from the entertainment field, the CLCV has turned to Alan Arkin, Harry Belafonte, Leonard

Bernstein, Judy Collins, Arthur Miller, Tony Randall, Carl Reiner, Robert Ryan, Tommy Smothers, and Barbra Streisand.

These representatives of the Left in America are the ones who are quoted in the literature sold by CLCV, in its advertisements, and in its promotional brochures.

FUND FOR PEACE

FUND FOR EDUCATION IN WORLD ORDER
NATIONAL CONVOCATION ON THE CHALLENGE OF BUILDING THE PEACE
PIERCE BUTLER JR. FOUNDATION FOR EDUCATION IN WORLD LAW

In 1966, the Fund for Education in World Order (FEWO) was organized by a group of American businessmen and academicians. (The FEWO was actually a successor organization to the Pierce Butler Jr. Foundation for Education in World Law, which was established in 1957.) In its early days, the FEWO had on its board of trustees a representative group from the liberal-left community, including: U.S. Senator Joseph S. Clark of Pennsylvania, the chairman of Members of Congress for Peace through Law; Andrew W. Cordier, a dean of Columbia University and a veteran employee of the United Nations; Norman Cousins, editor of *Saturday Review* and long-time pacifist; Robert W. Gilmore, president of the leftwing-pacifist Center for War/Peace Studies; Robert F. Goheen, the leftist president of Princeton University; Harry B. Hollins, director of the leftwing-internationalist World Law Fund; Arthur Larson, director of Duke University's Rule of Law Research Center and chairman of the ultra-leftist National Council for Civic Responsibility; Stewart R. Mott, a most generous angel for leftwing causes; President James M. Nabrit Jr. of Howard University; Earl D. Osborn, president of the leftwing Institute for International Order; and David S. Smith, the director of Columbia University's International Fellows Program.

Later additions to the board of trustees included: the Nigerian diplomat and veteran employee of the United Nations, Simeon O. Adebo; John C. Bennett, president of Union Theological Seminary and a leading leftist among American clergymen; Harrison Salisbury of the *New York Times* and a long-time apologist for the Soviet Union; and U.S. Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts, who established himself on the far left of the Republican Party and of the U.S. Senate.

Officers of the FEWO included: Randolph P. Compton, a vice president of Kidder, Peabody & Co.; Jack P. Jefferies, a member of the law firm of Lord, Day and Lord; Ira D. Wallach, president of Gottesman & Co.; and A. Michael Washburn, the executive director of the FEWO, who had served in the same capacity with the Pierce Butler Jr. Foundation for Education in World Law.

In its literature, the FEWO described its purpose: "The Fund seeks to create a group of thoughtful individuals who believe that man has it in his intellectual power – through research and education – to enhance the effectiveness of the existing system of international relations so that resort to war to settle disputes will no longer be inevitable." In an enlargement of that theme, the FEWO also said that its purpose was "to stimulate research and creative scholarship in the development of a workable, warless system of international relations and to impart such knowledge to the public."

The FEWO explained the "world order" in its title: "When we speak of world order, we are speaking of the problems of eliminating war and creating tolerable world conditions of social justice and economic welfare. Specific areas of interest include disarmament, enforceable international law, pacific settlement of disputes, peacekeeping, world economic development, scientific and technological revolutions, and human and social rights and their interrelationships. World organizations, international public institutions, regional arrangements, public and private transnational systems, nations and individuals are studied in relationship to these specific areas of interest."

From its beginnings, the FEWO worked through eight academic groups and six public education groups. The academic groups were Columbia University's School of International Affairs; Howard University's Law School; Duke University's Rule of Law Research Center; the University of Michigan's Center for Research on Conflict Resolution; Princeton University's Center of International Studies; Yale University's Law School; the United Nations Institute for Training and Research; and the World Law Fund. The public education groups were the Center for War/Peace Studies; the Grenville Clark Institute for World Law; the Institute for International Order; the Student Forum on International Order and World Peace; UN We Believe; and the World Law Fund. (*The Center for War/Peace Studies* "provides educational materials, an information service, and the counsel of skilled and experienced specialists" to non-governmental organizations. "Seven full-time consultants specializing in the problems of war and peace are on the staff of the Center working continually with church groups, women's organizations, labor, youth, and other national publics. Their special competence includes such fields as: international law, community organization, East-West relations, mass media, non-violent social change, arms control, and disarmament." The *Grenville Clark Institute for World Law* uses as its keystone the Declaration of the Dublin Conference of 1965. "The Declaration outlines the essential and inter-related elements of an effective world federation. Its adherents seek a fundamental strengthening of the United Nations Charter which would result in a world federal government 'with closely defined and limited' yet fully adequate powers to prevent war and to further the economic and social advancement of the underdeveloped states." *The Institute for International Order* states: "Involving the individual citizen in building a warless world is the special concern of the Institute . . . . Thus, the Institute seeks to create an awareness of the role private citizens can play in helping to build peace through comprehending the problem of settling international disputes, strengthening the United Nations, and promoting meaningful dialogue between people and among peoples." *The Student Forum on International Order and World Peace* "is a tangible expression of student concern with issues of war and peace. Founded by a group of undergraduates in 1966 following a conference on war prevention held at Sarah Lawrence College, the goal of the Student Forum is the introduction of formal accredited programs of war/peace studies into the college curriculum . . . to establish on all major campuses a nucleus of responsible students who are informed and articulate on the subject of world order. These students will work with interested faculty and administrators to introduce war/peace materials into the course offerings of several appropriate disciplines – political science, history, sociology, psychology, economics, biology, philosophy, and theology." *UN We Believe* "unites America's top business and labor leaders in a nation-wide effort to make the UN a more effective instrument for keeping the peace." UN We Believe "sponsors a continuing series of industry conferences . . . to bring corporate heads and union leaders together with UN delegates and members of the Secretariat. At these high-level meetings . . . the subject for discussion is how the corporation and the union can make the UN more effective." *The World Law Fund* "acts as a catalyst with existing educational institutions. Since 1962 it has sought to introduce the subject of world order – focused on war prevention – into all major educational systems of the world on the graduate, undergraduate and high school levels.")

On March 5, 1969, the FEWO held its first National Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace. About two thousand persons attended the Convocations's luncheon and panel discussions at the New York Hilton. The master of ceremonies for the proceedings was Chet Huntley. Participants in the convocation included such notorious leftists as William Sloane Coffin, Corliss Lamont, Floyd McKissick, Hans Morgenthau, Rabbi Louis Newman, Paul O'Dwyer, Marcus Raskin, Arthur Waskow, Jerome Wiesner, Howard Zinn, U.S. Senators Alan Cranston of California, J. William Fulbright of Arkansas, Jacob Javits of New York, and George McGovern of South Dakota, and former U.S. Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska.

The Convocation was nothing less than an anti-United States propaganda binge, with emphasis on anti-Vietnam War tirades, pro-Communist effusions, and hysterical pleas for disarmament. Topics discussed included: "What Is True Security: Ultimate Weapons or No Weapons?" – "Are National Self-interest and World Peace Compatible?" – "How Can We Build an Effective Constituency for Peace?" – "Is America Becoming a Militaristic Society?" Viet Cong flags – but not the American flag – were flown at the luncheon.

The main speaker at the Convocation was Arkansas' Senator J. William Fulbright. However, before Fulbright completed his speech, he was interrupted by a group of hecklers who called themselves "Veterans and Reservists to End the War in Vietnam." The hecklers dumped a pig's head on Fulbright's plate. They repeated the performance with another pig's head placed before Senator Jacob Javits. The result was that the demonstrators reaped far more publicity than did the utterances of the assembled leftists.

After the first National Convocation, the Fund for Education in World Order underwent a change of name. It became the Fund for Peace. New personnel were brought onto the scene to bolster the group's sagging prestige after the "pig's head" incidents. Joseph P. Lyford became president. George W. Ball (former Under Secretary of State) and Najeeb E. Halaby (president of Pan American World Airways) became co-chairmen. Veterans of the infamous Pugwash Conferences were recruited into the Fund for Peace: Harrison Brown, Paul Doty, Bernard Feld, Franklin Long, and Eugene Rabinowitch.

Strong links were forged between the Fund for Peace and Robert M. Hutchins' Fund for the Republic-Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions complex. Simeon O. Adebo, Harry Ashmore, Harrison Brown, Clark Kerr, Edward Lamb, Morris L. Levinson, Joseph Lyford, Stewart R. Mott, Jubal Parten, Isidor I. Rabi, and Harold Willens were members of the Fund for Peace and were affiliated with either the Fund for the Republic or the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Also in the Fund for Peace were Generals James Gavin and Matthew Ridgway, Averell Harriman, Hubert Humphrey, Eugene V. Rostow, and Adam Yarmolinsky.

In the newly-named Fund for Peace, Najeeb E. Halaby was the guiding genius. As president of Pan American World Airways he had shown a penchant for Soviet-American relations. On the American side, he had been chiefly responsible for the implementation of a reciprocal agreement whereby Pan Am and Aeroflot exchanged weekly flights between New York and Moscow, despite huge financial losses to both airlines.

Shortly after assuming leadership of the Fund for Peace, Halaby began a lively campaign to finance a second National Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace. In his appeal for funds, he wrote: "Our preoccupation with the warfare threat system has left us unprotected against the growth of those very forces – poverty, racism, overpopulation, disease, the deterioration of shelter – which are the major causes of the fear and hatred that explode into organized violence. Fortunately, as these problems intensify and a time for solution grows shorter, there are growing indications that in both the USSR and the United States influential groups recognize the need for action. Reports on the 19th Pugwash Conference at Sochi [in the U.S.S.R.] are clear proof that thoughtful leaders in the Soviet Union and in our country will commit themselves to a deceleration of the arms race. The current Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) are a concrete expression of the countries' common interest in halting the buildup of huge new weapons systems . . . . But cooperation is possible only when two peoples trust and understand each other. We need to move beyond the private, non-governmental meetings, such as Pugwash . . . . "

Halaby's appeal for support in his ambitious fling at appeasement was remarkably successful. He received contributions from more than forty American business firms, including American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Bank of America, the Boeing Company, Chrysler Corporation, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Corning Glass, Bendix International, Hiram Walker & Sons, Control Data Company, Riggs National Bank, and Bankers Trust Company.

As sponsors for the second National Convocation, Halaby recruited such prestigious leftwing organizations as Americans for Democratic Action, the League for Industrial Democracy, the Council for a Livable World, the National Committee for an Effective Congress, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the New York Fellowship for Reconciliation, World Federalists, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

When Halaby circulated the planned agenda for the second National Convocation, he made it obvious that he saw virtually no substantive differences between the United States and the Soviet Union. But where differences did exist, he fully expected that a dialogue between Soviet and American "experts" at the Convocation and similar affairs would serve to resolve the differences.

Halaby said that the purpose of the National Convocation was "to continue the development of an effective constituency for peace and to focus the attention of the American public on the prospects for practical cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States."

Under the heading, "Prospects for Cooperation," Halaby ignored the continuing barbarous history of Soviet imperialism and aggression, and said: "At no other time since the end of World War II have the differences dividing the Soviet Union and the United States seemed so open to rational discussion and pragmatic resolution. In recent years the two countries have reached agreement on a number of arms control measures. Quiet consultations between the two governments have averted direct confrontations in several parts of the world. An increasing number of intensive, private discussions between leading citizens of both countries take place each year. And yet enormous mistrust, the legacy of years of arms race and propaganda overkill, continues to haunt public discussion and intimidate government officials on both sides."

Halaby seemed determined to find that, in the tumultuous history of Soviet-American relations, the two powers were not only equally culpable for creating bad will but also equally capable of generating the good will required to arrive at a utopian condition of peaceful coexistence.

In his "Prospects for Cooperation," Halaby said: "This Convocation has been called in the belief that unless and until the fear that poisons each country's [*sic*] view of the other is dispelled, little progress is possible on the great world problems which confront all nations. Until the arms race is curbed, neither country [*sic*] will have enough resources to confront growing domestic problems, much less the enormous needs of the developing countries. Existing international mechanisms for dealing with violence, hunger, injustice, and destruction of the environment will deteriorate and needed new ones will go unformed. This Convocation will engage leading Soviet and American citizens in a constructive exploration of practical ways in which the two countries might work together and with the peoples of other countries for peace and justice. The sponsors of the Convocation recognize, however, that some differences in goals and conflicts of interest will persist in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Even in areas of common interest and mutual advantage, progress will only be attained through difficult and complex negotiations."

When it was time for Halaby to discuss "The Challenge of Building Peace," he displayed his eagerness to forgive and forget Soviet rapacity and the captivity of eastern Europe and the Baltic States. Nor did he make any reference to Soviet involvement in the Vietnam War or Soviet subversion throughout every continent. Instead, Halaby was anxious to ascribe humanitarian sensibilities to Soviet leaders: "The long and bloody era of national parochialism and unilateral action has been undermined by the onward rush of science, technology, and economics. A new era of global consciousness and interdependence is emerging. The immediate Challenge of Building the Peace is the challenge of finding specific, practical ways in which countries can mute the conflicts of the past and work together to meet the common problems of our earth. The Soviet Union and the United States can lead mankind in a giant step toward peace."

When Halaby proposed topics for American and Soviet panelists at the National Convocation, he indulged in just about every asininity that could be found in the leftist-liberal litany whenever Soviet-American relations came under discussion: "What is the character of the two societies? Are they converging politically, economically or socially? – How is the arms race related to other problems of survival and how can sufficient trust be built up to allow progress? – How can the two countries [*sic*] cooperate to limit violence in the third world and to avoid involvement on opposite sides when it does occur? – How can

East/West trade and travel be significantly expanded? – What ideas and experiences can the two countries [*sic*] offer each other for solving the problems of urban, industrialized societies? – What steps can the two take to preserve and enhance the world environment? – Can Soviets and Americans work together to further economic development and social justice in the third world? – In what ways can the Soviet Union and the United States cooperate to advance science and technology, while controlling its possible adverse effects?"

In March 1970, President Joseph P. Lyford spent a week in Moscow, where he made plans with Soviet officials to have Russian "experts" attend the National Convocation in New York City. From Moscow Lyford formally announced that the convocation would be held on April 29 at the New York Hilton – scene of the 1969 fiasco. Lyford seemed especially proud that Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin had sent him a message saying that "he supported fully the convocation and regarded it as an important step to improve Soviet-American relations."

Lyford proved himself to be as unrealistic as Halaby in his assessment of the necessity and importance of the propaganda orgy that was forthcoming. Because a relatively small number of corporations and individuals contributed approximately $75,000 (tax-deductible, of course) to underwrite the Soviet-American parley, he found "an unmistakable indication that a large percentage of the American people – including the business community – is impatient for an end to the cold war. There is an obvious and growing public demand for some practical suggestions from the best minds in both the United States and the Soviet Union as to how all of us are going to survive in an age of nuclear weapons, pollution and threatened starvation in the underdeveloped nations."

On April 29, the second National Convocation was held. The American participants, most of whom had been at some time or another in federal governmental policy-making positions, included: Zbigniew Brzezinski, Bernard Feld, Adrian Fisher, William C. Foster, John Kenneth Galbraith, Richard Gardner, Arthur Goldberg, Ernest Gross, Morton Halperin, Herman Kahn, George Kistiakowsky, Foy Kohler, Robert Roosa, James Roosevelt, Marshall Shulman, and Cyrus Vance.

The main speaker at the National Convocation was Under Secretary of State Elliot L. Richardson, whose appearance indicated that the Department of State gave its blessing to the prestigious gathering of leftwing pacifists. Richardson told the audience of more than two thousand what it wanted to hear. He talked about areas of common interest shared by the United States and the Soviet Union. He called for a strengthening of United Nations mechanisms to insure that the UN could more effectively cope with local conflicts. He urged the Soviet Union to cooperate with the United States in reviving and strengthening the World Court and in making the "peace-keeping" functions of the UN more workable. He pleaded for "a securely ordered world free of the shadow of thermonuclear war." But somehow in his remarks, Richardson managed to avoid even the slightest reference to the war in Vietnam.

Panelists at the National Convocation dealt with such topics as "Protection of the Environment," "Aid for the Developing Nations," "Expansion of East-West Trade," and "Common Interests and Obstacles to Cooperation." The *New York Times* correspondent on the scene, Peter Grose, reported that "panels of prominent Americans and Russians struggled here all day yesterday to find new opportunities for a peaceful dialogue." In fact, however, the ten-man delegation representing the government of the Soviet Union added precious little to the "peaceful dialogue," and were content to listen to the Americans' abject plans for appeasement directed at the Communist world, coupled with harsh criticism of a safe and sane American foreign policy. (On the day following the National Convocation, the Soviet delegates and some of the principal American participants met privately at Princeton University. The Americans who attended the parley on arms control and disarmament included: former U.S. Senator Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, in 1970 president of the ultra-leftwing World Federalists; Bernard Feld, a physicist and an official of the ultra-leftwing Council for a Livable World and the Peace Research Institute; Adrian Fisher, formerly Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; George Kistiakowsky, formerly a science advisor to Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy and, in 1970, vice president of the National Academy of Sciences; and Franklin A. Long, a chemist and formerly an assistant director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.)

METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL ACTION

METHODIST FEDERATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE
SOCIAL SERVICE BULLETIN
SOCIAL QUESTIONS BULLETIN

On July 7, 1953, Benjamin Gitlow – a founder and former general secretary of the Communist Party in the United States – testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Mr. Gitlow was asked: "What kind of an organization was the Methodist Federation for Social Action, and how did it differ from a Communist-front organization?"

Replied Mr. Gitlow: "The Methodist Federation for Social Action, originally called the Methodist Federation for Social Service, was first organized by a group of Socialist-Marxist clergymen of the Methodist Church, headed by Dr. Harry F. Ward. Dr. Ward was the organizer, for almost a lifetime its secretary and actual leader. He at all times set its ideological and political pattern. Its objective was to transform the Methodist Church and Christianity into an instrument for the achievement of socialism. It was established in 1907, twelve years before the organization of the Communist Party of the United States in 1919. The outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in November 1917 had a tremendous effect upon the Socialist ministers of this organization and especially upon Dr. Ward. When the Communist Party was organized in 1919, Dr. Ward was already a convinced Communist with a few insignificant minor reservations. By 1920 he was already, though not yet a member of the Communist Party, cooperating and collaborating with the Communist Party. This collaboration of Dr. Ward with the Communist Party was reflected in the expressions and activities of the Methodist Federation for Social Action.

"The inner hard core of the Methodist Federation consisted, up to the time Jack R. McMichael, a member and leader of the Young Communist League, was elected its executive secretary after Dr. Ward relinquished his post, of a Communist cell headed by Ward, which functioned under the direction of the Communist Party. McMichael became the cell's head but Dr. Ward continued to be a part of it. The Methodist Federation for Social Action was always in the grip of this Communist Party cell and was therefore an instrument through which the Communist Party operated on the religious field. It was not, therefore, a typical Communist united-front organization, set up by the Communist Party, which invites other organizations to affiliate and participate in the affairs of the united-front organization.

"One of the main functions of a united-front organization is to put the Communist Party in contact with the leaders of mass organizations whose membership runs into the thousands and millions. The party seeks through the united-front organizations to recruit into the party those leaders who cooperate with the party and to destroy those leaders who oppose the Communist Party. In addition, it gives the party free access to the millions of members drawn together by the united front to mobilize them in support of Communist Party actions and to recruit large numbers of them directly into the party. The united-front organizations also act as a cover for Communist infiltration activities in other fields for sabotage and espionage purposes.

"The Methodist Federation for Social Action is a membership organization made up entirely of Methodists. It does not affiliate other organizations with it. The Communist Party is not included as an affiliate. The organization is a Communist Party instrument controlled by the Communist Party through the Communist cell secretly operating as a Communist Party disciplined unit in the Federation.

" . . . The Methodist Federation for Social Action was affiliated with and collaborated most closely with the American League against War and Fascism, the American League for Peace and Democracy, and the American Youth Congress. It was no accident that Dr. Ward, the organizer and leader of the Methodist Federation, became the chairman, and served in that capacity for many years, of both the American League against War and Fascism and the American League for Peace and Democracy. Rev. Jack McMichael was the chairman for many years of the American Youth Congress."

In 1908, at the General Conference of the Methodist Church, the Methodist Federation was commissioned to study certain questions. At the 1912 General Conference, the Methodist Church leaders approved certain measures of social reform and principles of social progress enunciated in the report of the Methodist Federation. At the same time, the General Conference declared the Methodist Federation to be the executive agency to rally the forces of the Methodist Church in support of those measures.

In 1924, at the General Conference of the Methodist Church, the following resolution was adopted: "Whereas, It is imperative that there be some authorized agency in the Methodist Episcopal Church for the purpose of raising before the Church the question of the social implications of the gospel of Jesus; therefore [be it] Resolved, That we commend the Methodist Federation for Social Service for its splendid activities in carrying on the work specified herein."

By 1928, the Methodist Federation, which was, in effect, given a blank check by the Methodist Church to propagate the "social gospel," was governed by an executive committee of five and a general council of fifty-six. Both governing groups were elected by the membership of the Federation, but for all practical purposes the Federation was run exclusively by Harry F. Ward and a fellow Communist, Winifred L. Chappell. The two of them used the Federation's *Social Service Bulletin* as the vehicle for their anti-religious, pro-Communist propaganda.

When Benjamin Gitlow testified before HCUA, he was asked: "What do you consider the aims of the Communist infiltration of religion?" Gitlow, who was the leader of the Communist Party when Ward and Chappell were in full command of the Methodist Federation, replied: "Communist infiltration of the religious field aims to undermine faith in the American system. It seeks to subvert the religious spirit on the basis of social-economic creeds and seditious politics. It strives to poison the minds of a religious people with a destructive, atheistic ideology cloaked in the name of social action and religious interpretations based upon the Bible, that the religious agents of Communist infiltration are wont to call prophetic religion. The record proves that the Methodist Federation for Social Action served the Communists ideally in this diabolic scheme . . . . Its limited, small membership, fluctuating between 2,000 and 10,000, is dominated by a handful of Communists who never officially avowed their Communist affiliations. The Communists in the organization maintained an alliance with militant, revolutionary Socialists, who were not under Communist discipline, but who nevertheless went along with the Communists. The Communists operated within the Methodist Federation for Social Action on the premise that it was important to keep within the Methodist Federation for Social Action all the Socialist, leftist, pacifist, and the so-called liberal and progressive elements just so long as they went together with the Communists on specific issues. Behind the façade of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, the Communists posed as religious reformers fighting orthodoxy and reaction in religion."

Benjamin Gitlow's observations on the Methodist Federation and Harry Ward were confirmed by Joseph Zack Kornfeder in testimony before the HCUA. Kornfeder was an original member of the Communist Party in the United States. He attended the Lenin Institute in Moscow, and while in Moscow was attached to the headquarters of the Communist International for two years. Kornfeder was asked: "What method is the Communist Party using in the United States to accomplish the elimination of religion eventually?" Kornfeder replied: "In the United States the attack is on what they would call the propaganda level; that is, indoctrination. They still maintain their position of atheism, but as for the popular approach, that is, what they would call agitation, they concentrate entirely on the method of boring from within the church laid down in that pattern I explained of the living church but adapted to conditions in the United States." [Kornfeder had earlier explained: "The living church movement was based on the idea of interpreting the teachings of Christ and the Apostles in a way that would serve to a large extent Communist purposes; that is, for instance, there is a part in the Bible which says that Christ chased the money changers out of the temple. Well, that would be interpreted that Christ was an anticapitalist. The part of Christ's story in the Bible of persecution under the Roman Empire and of Christianity being a movement against Roman slavery, that it was based on the work of an individual, as an individual, was cleverly utilized to indicate that Christianity is a movement of the masses against the ruling classes. That is, all the things in the Bible or about the Apostles that could be used for a materialistic interpretation combined with the theological approach were utilized to fashion the ideology for their living church movement."]

Kornfeder was asked: " . . . How have they [the Communists] used this method of infiltration [of the churches]?" He testified: "Well, I think their pattern of infiltration can best be traced by a study of the methods of the Methodist Federation for Social Service headed by Harry F. Ward, reverend professor of religion, who was in Moscow on several consultations and who was the granddaddy, as it were, of how to apply [infiltration]."

In 1929, when Kornfeder was in Moscow, he heard Harry F. Ward and his work discussed in the Anglo-American Secretariat, where Ward was portrayed as the architect of the methods by which churches could be infiltrated ("of Communists and fellow travelers working inside the churches, giving themselves the coloring of religious reformers and of getting the church in the social side, away from spiritualism").

From his Moscow experiences, Kornfeder recalled: "From what I heard I am sure he [Harry F. Ward] saw Yaroslawsky. Emil Yaroslawsky was the head of the Anti-God Society of the Soviet Union, and I am sure he [Ward] saw [Nikolai] Bukharin, who was at that time the head theoretician of the Communist International, and I am fairly certain in my mind that he [Ward] also saw Joe Stalin, because Joe Stalin was very much interested in this living-church approach because he was the one that originally was in charge of it, in the Politbureau – Joe Stalin. In fact, when one studies the methods of the Methodist Federation, I wonder who learned from whom, whether it was Harry F. Ward who learned from Stalin or whether Stalin learned from Harry Ward. They probably learned from each other the methods as to how to do it inside the church. I mean, how to combine theology with the concepts of materialism and how to propagate it and agitate it and organize it, and so on."

By 1932, any doubts that Harry F. Ward's Methodist Federation was completely pro-Communist should have been dispelled. At that time, the Methodist Federation was cooperating with the Federal Council of Churches, the American Civil Liberties Union, the League for Industrial Democracy, Labor Research Association, International Labor Defense, the Committee on Militarism in Education, and Fellowship of Reconciliation – a representative collection of the most radical Communist, Communist-oriented, and pro-Communist groups in the country.

At the Methodist Federation's 1936 conference, the pro-Communist, thoroughly Marxist stance was plainly evident: "The present capitalistic order, with its profit motive, has outlived its usefulness and should be replaced by an order capable of providing abundant life, physical and cultural, for all." And, the Federation reiterated its main desire to abolish private property. (" . . . The theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." Marx, *Communist Manifesto.*)

It was at the same 1936 conference that the Methodist Federation voted to affiliate with the American League against War and Fascism (in 1937, the name was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy). The American League was established by the Communists in the United States "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." (Leonard Patterson testified before HCUA that, when he was a leading member of the Communist Party, he was assigned to the American League, along with fellow-Communists Earl Browder, Manning Johnson, Victor Jerome, and Harry F. Ward.)

Harry F. Ward's commitment to the Soviet Union's foreign policy, through his work in the American League, was supplemented by his leadership in the Methodist Federation. Writing in the Federation's *Social Questions Bulletin* in November 1939, he said: "The question of the outcome of the moral emotions now being aroused against the

Soviet also has another bearing. Here [in the United States] they are being translated into anti-Communism." And, by 1939, the Federation and Ward could appreciate anti-Communism as a frontal attack upon them. The Federation, in 1939, made no secret of its ambition to see "social economic planning" and "social ownership" implanted in the United States. As the Federation explained: "The only country that has a complete social economic plan is the Soviet Union." Therefore, it behooved the United States to emulate the Soviet Union. (As early as 1919, Harry Ward, writing in his *The New Social Order,* pronounced the system under which our government existed to be doomed to collapse and said that the propertied class in the United States must either accept a new social order established by the world proletariat or expect a violent revolution to bring about the change. In 1938, the Methodist Federation advocated for the United States the total abolition of political parties, legislative bodies, courts and judges, and all elected officials on national, state, and local levels. In other words, the Methodist Federation wanted to Sovietize America.)

On the masthead of the October 1940 *Social Questions Bulletin,* there was a further endorsement of Communism: *"Social Questions Bulletin* of the Methodist Federation for Social Service (unofficial), an organization which rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society; which seeks to replace it with social-economic planning in order to develop a society without class distinctions and privileges." The attempt to portray the Methodist Federation as "unofficial" in its relationship to the Methodist Church was patently ridiculous since the Federation was endorsed at that time by such influential Methodist Bishops as Francis J. McConnell of New York City, G. Bromley Oxnam of Omaha, James C. Baker of San Francisco, and Paul B. Kern of Nashville.

In 1944, Harry F. Ward relinquished his position as executive secretary of the Methodist Federation to Communist Jack McMichael whose Communist loyalties and activities were well known through his activities as a leader of the Young Communist League and as an important member of the Communist Party. In addition to his role as executive secretary, McMichael became the head of the Communist cell which directed the activities of the Methodist Federation.

Under McMichael's leadership, the Federation remained as brazenly pro-Communist as it had become under Harry F. Ward. At the annual conference in 1947, Communists and fellow travelers (Jerome Davis, Carl Marzani, Clyde Miller, Kermit Eby) were very much in evidence as the Federation condemned U.S. foreign policy and praised Soviet foreign policy; condemned Nationalist China and praised Red China; and allowed the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist") to display and sell its pro-Soviet propaganda. A few Methodist ministers and laymen went to the trouble of disavowing the Methodist Federation, but such gestures over the years have been fruitless when placed alongside the influences of the prominent Communists and pro-Communists who, in the guise of religious Methodists, have given the Methodist Federation their unstinting support. (To name a few: Bishop Edgar A. Love, Mary McLeod Bethune, Franklin H. Littell, Harold C. Case, Henry Hitt Crane, James Dombrowski, Willard Uphaus, Ralph Sockman, Vincent Hallinan, Louise Pettibone Smith, Joseph F. Fletcher, Stephen Fritchman, Ruth Gage-Colby, Alex Munsell, Maud Russell, Walter Muelder, Kermit Eby, Carl Braden, and Aubrey Williams. As of 1948, the Federation claimed more than twenty Bishops and fifty-five hundred pastors and laymen as members.)

In 1948, the Federation's "Program of Study and Action" offered something for everyone on the left. It advocated repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor act, abolition of poll taxes, abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Attorney-General's list of subversive organizations, exposure and eradication of "anti-Semitism," lowering of the voting age to eighteen, "civil rights" legislation, repeal of the anti-subversive Smith Act, support of the Fair Employment Practices Committee, support of the United Nations and its Declaration of Human Rights, recognition of Red China, and the transfer of control of atomic power to the United Nations, along with outlawing of the atom bomb through UN action. The Federation also urged Methodists to "help find socially conscious candidates to run for office," to work for a Socialist economy, and to encourage the U.S. government to "engage in friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union."

In 1949, about sixty members of the Methodist Federation signed an open statement, circulated by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, which merely parroted the phony "peace" propaganda emanating from Moscow. In 1950, the Federation's action program called for the abolition of loyalty oaths and the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, defense of the Communist Party in the United States, repeal of the anti-subversive Smith Act, defeat of the anti-subversive Mundt-Nixon Bill, and amnesty for "political prisoners" – Communists and conscientious objectors. In 1951, the Federation concentrated on advocating U.S. diplomatic recognition for Red China and U.S. support for Red China's admission to United Nations membership. In 1952, the Federation concentrated a great deal of energy on seeking clemency for the convicted atom spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. In 1954, the Federation announced: "We heartily commend the work of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born ["subversive and Communist"] in their defense of the victims [*sic*] of the Walter-McCarran Act." In 1956, the Federation made strenuous efforts through the federal court system to prevent the reprinting of *Handbook for Americans,* one of the most popular and informative publications ever issued by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. (The *Handbook,* a study of the Communist Party, put the spotlight on several of the Federation's luminaries.)

Periodically, well-intentioned Methodist clergy and laymen tried to disassociate the Methodist Church from the Methodist Federation. They tried to have the Federation drop the use of the word "Methodist" but to no avail. Some headway was made when the Federation was evicted in the 1950's from the Methodist Church's building in New York City, but a complete break was never made between the Church and the Federation.

In 1964, the Church issued a statement: "Whereas uncertainty has existed [the uncertainty was of *forty years'* duration] concerning the status of the unofficial Methodist Federation for Social Action, and, Whereas a factual and objective statement published in the Discipline should prevent any future misunderstanding, therefore, Be It Resolved that the General Conference of 1964 authorize the following statement to be included in the Discipline – 'The Methodist Federation for Social Action is an unofficial fellowship for study, organized as the Methodist Federation for Social Service in 1907, authorized by the General Conference of 1908 to call the attention of the church to the more important social issues, without committing the Methodist Church to the opinions expressed by the Federation.' "

As of 1968, the Methodist Federation claimed a membership of three thousand. In a talented display of Aesopian linguistics, the Federation describes its current mission: "Seeks to deepen within the Church the sense of social obligation and the opportunity to study, from the Christian point of view, social problems and their solutions, and to promote social action in the spirit of Jesus; stands for the complete abolition of war; rejects the method of the struggle for profit as the economic base for society and seeks to replace it with social-economic planning to develop a society without class or group discriminations and privileges."

For more than a decade, the Methodist Federation has been directed by its executive secretary, Lee H. Ball. Ball came to the position with credentials as Red as those held by his predecessors, Harry F. Ward and Jack R. McMichael. Ball has been affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); the American Peace Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); the China Welfare Appeal ("subversive"); the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges ("Communist front"); the Committee for Citizenship Rights ("to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law"); the Committee to End Sedition Laws ("complete domination by the Communist Party"); the Committee of One Thousand ("Communist created and controlled front organization"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Conference for Legislation in the National Interest ("Communist front"); the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front" – "created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party"); the International Workers Order ("subversive and Communist"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the New York Conference for Inalienable Rights ("Communist front"); the *Protestant* ("Communist front"); the Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist"); the Schneiderman-Darcy

Defense Committee ("Communist"); and various "open letter" projects and petitions on behalf of the Communist Party and individual Communists.

Ball's and the Methodist Federation's complete adherence to the Communist-oriented traditions established by Harry F. Ward and his Moscow bosses has been best demonstrated on the occasion of Lenin's centenary. Ball, as executive secretary of the Methodist Federation, contributed a statement to the Communists' *Daily World* issue of April 23, 1970: "I have had the privilege of making two visits to the Soviet Union. When one looks upon Lenin, as he lies full length in his tomb in Red Square, one thinks that this small and seemingly frail man, with his almost delicate hands and fingers, has written his name indelibly in the books of world history. He devised and made effective a new way of living for 180 million people, wherein unemployment is no longer known, wherein all the children are in school and students are paid to go to college, wherein poverty is abolished, wherein apartments and housing are built for the people, wherein the sick are cared for without expense to themselves, wherein there is hunger no more, wherein the people are dedicated to peace.

"He set in motion a new way of living for other millions of people beyond the Soviet Union, a new way of living that is testing all of mankind's older ways of living.

"There are many pictures of Lenin across the width of the Soviet Union, and many statues. An unforgettable statue stands before the Pioneer Palace in Tashkent – Lenin is seated, holding a child on his knee, looking upon her with affection. This statue commemorates Lenin's concern for education. In the bitter early days when 19 foreign countries were on Soviet soil trying to strangle this new way of life, Lenin was worrying because the children in far-away Tashkent could not read, and despite the war he sent a trainload of teachers to Tashkent. So disorganized was the country, it took them 63 days to arrive!"

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The National Education Association was founded in 1857 by forty-three educators from ten states. Their purpose was to "elevate the character and advance the interests of the profession of teaching" and to "promote the cause of popular education in the United States." Growth of the NEA was rather slow. By 1900, it had little more than two thousand members; by 1920, 52,000; and in 1930, 216,000. And what growth occurred was attributable in great part to school superintendents who applied subtle pressure upon teachers to join.

By 1970, the NEA had close to one million members in more than sixty state groups and more than eight thousand local groups. It is probably the largest professional organization in the world and includes within its membership elementary and secondary school teachers, college and university faculty members, administrators, principals, counselors, and others employed in education.

Along with its membership growth, the NEA became one of the largest non-governmental bureaucratic complexes in the world. It has commissions and/or committees on citizenship, credit unions, professional rights and responsibilities, educational finance, educational policies, educational travel, international relations, legislation, professional ethics, safety, teacher education and professional standards, and teacher retirement. There are joint commissions: the NEA and the American Textbook Publishers Institute; the NEA and the American Legion; the NEA and the American Library Association; the NEA and the American Medical Association; the NEA and the American Teachers Association; the NEA and the Magazine Publishers Association; the NEA and the National Congress of Parents and Teachers; and the NEA and the National School Boards Association.

At its Washington, D.C., headquarters, the NEA has departments concerned with adult education; audio-visual services; educational travel; press, radio, and television relations; records; educational research; rural service; state and federal relations; art education; business education; classroom teachers; driver education; educational secretaries; elementary-kindergarten-nursery education; elementary school principals; exceptional children; foreign languages; health-physical education-recreation; higher education; home economics; industrial arts; journalism directors; mathematics teachers; music educators; retired teachers; school administrators; school librarians; school public relations; science teachers; secondary-school principals; social studies; speech; supervision and curriculum development; teacher education; vocational education; and women deans and counselors.

The NEA's major publications are *Today's Education*; *Annual Proceedings*; and *Research Bulletin.*

Members are solicited by NEA, which offers many promises: "*Your salary will climb . . . . You will save money.* NEA's continuing work with the Congress and with the Treasury Department in achieving tax equity – tax savings – for you. Certain educational expenses are now deductible . . . [also] group insurance [and] NEA's Travel Service . . . . *Your working conditions will improve.* Research disclosures, professionally endorsed practices, recommended standards, written policies, and remedial legislation sponsored by professional associations result in better personnel procedures and working conditions for you . . . . *Your rights will be defended* . . . with legal counsel and legal action . . . . *You will get the facts you need.* The most authoritative research in many fields of vital interest to you is available at NEA . . . . *You will up-date your knowledge and improve your skills.* In an age of change you cannot afford to stand still. NEA's studies of classroom problems, frequent instructional conferences, [and NEA publications] . . . . *Your rating with the public will go up.* NEA films, network radio and TV shows, a friendlier and better-informed press, educator-publisher conferences, co-operative contacts with the nation's foremost lay organizations, and special events, such as American Education Week and Teaching Career Month, are helping to build the respect and prestige you want and need as a professional person. *You will influence national policy.* NEA is your 'Window on Washington,' your voice in the educational policies of the national government. Our united strength in NEA will determine what federal funds are used for school construction, teachers' salaries, scholarships, or other educational purposes. For your own welfare and that of the schools, you need an able spokesman at all times before the Congress, and with many departments and agencies of the federal government. *You will make teaching a better profession.* NEA's Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Ethics Committee, Citizenship Committee, and many other NEA units and agencies are setting high standards of preparation, ethical conduct, and self-direction for the profession."

NEA has six officers, an executive committee, a board of trustees, and a governing body drawn from every state. But the real power lies in the office of executive secretary, a position held by William G. Carr in NEA's most formative years, 1952-1967.

In 1954, the House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations stated unequivocally that the NEA was a component part of a network or cartel in the social sciences. (Other component parts were the Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, Falk, and Russel Sage Foundations; the Commonwealth Fund; the Council of Learned Societies; the American Council on Education; the National Academy of Sciences;

the National Research Council; the National Science Foundation; the Social Science Research Council; the American Historical Association; the Progressive Education Association; the John Dewey Society; the Institute of Pacific Relations; the League for Industrial Democracy; and the American Labor Education Service.)

The social sciences cartel was committed to the implementation of the 1934 Report of the Commission on Social Studies of the American Historical Association, another member organization in the cartel. According to the Report, social sciences were to be the core of school curricula in order to foster indoctrination for collectivism. "Progressives" would re-write textbooks and teachers' syllabi and prepare other teaching materials for indoctrination purposes. Excerpts from the Report indicated that the social science cartel was embarking on a pro-Socialist revolution: "Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging." – " . . . The specific form which this collectivism . . . will take . . . is by no means clear . . . . It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property, or it may entail the preservation of private property extended and distributed among the masses." – "Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligations, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedures to the requirements of the emerging integrated order." – "The writers of textbooks may be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference . . . . Makers of programs in the social sciences . . . may be expected . . . to recast existing syllabi and schemes of instruction in accordance with their judgment . . . . " – " . . . Colleges and universities offering courses of instruction for teachers will review their current programs and provide for prospective teachers courses of instruction in general harmony with the Commission's frame of reference."

In the same year that the American Historical Association's Report of the Commission on Social Studies was issued, Willard E. Givens delivered a report to the NEA's annual meeting. Givens, then a superintendent of schools in Oakland, California, served from 1935 until 1952 as NEA's executive secretary. In his 1934 Report ("Education for the New America"), Givens said: "This report comes directly from the thinking together of more than 1,000 members of the Department of Superintendence.

"In this critical transition period, great issues confront us, especially the issue of building an economy of plenty for all. We are convinced that we stand today at the verge of a great culture. We are now entering an epoch in which man can bring forth a civilization of abundance, of tolerance, and of beauty. The facts justify the conclusion that the existing economic system, if run at its full capacity and efficiency, can wipe out economic insecurity for every American. In fact, engineers assure us that the production system cannot be kept going unless we distribute a very large amount of purchasing power to all of the people. A niggardly buying power and a policy of restriction of output will destroy our potentially magnificent system.

"But to achieve these things, many drastic changes must be made. A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the 'owners,' must be subjected to a large degree of social control. A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift nation-wide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of all people.

"The crucial need of a vast campaign to create a new climate of economic, social understanding among our adult population is shown by the danger in the Fascist challenge to democracy. We are convinced that the American people wish to preserve the democratic way of social change. But that assumes the consent of the people, and that can be given only when the people understand. Hence, it is our conviction that the educational workers of America must bind themselves together now in a powerful union to create tens of thousands of citizens' groups to study these critical economic and social problems. Every avenue of information and education should be used to realize the one economic issue of the day realistic to our people – namely a plenty economy vs. a poverty economy."

Givens, who would dominate NEA's activities for seventeen years, had joined NEA's newly-established Committee on Social-Economic Goals for America in 1931. He shared leadership of the Committee with the patriarch of progressive education and honorary NEA president, John Dewey. The purpose of the Givens-Dewey Committee was explained in January 1934: "If the present functioning of the Federal Government under the National Recovery Act (NRA) and associated administrative devices seem to violate the spirit of the Constitution and the founding fathers of the United States, we need to realize that the real violation came earlier; that the real encroachments upon the rights of the individual are not primarily political, but financial; that they involve not the state but financial corporate groups of such magnitude that the largest of them controls a wealth greater than that of 20 states and exerts over the persons of their employees a degree of control heretofore unmatched except in armies."

What Givens contributed to the NEA was the idea that class warfare ("a plenty economy vs. a poverty economy") was the American way of life. Capitalism was the enemy of the American people. Educators, guided by the NEA, could assume leadership in the war to convert America from a capitalist society to "a unified national system in the interest of all people" (i.e., a socialist society). The major weapon used by Givens (and his successor and assistant, William G. Carr, and Carr's successor and assistant, Sam Lambert) would be so-called federal-aid-to-education. The long-range goal was to have America's public school systems financed by the federal government rather than by local governments. The NEA, as the largest organized voice for teachers, could exert the teacher-vote as a pressure on the Congress to appropriate "federal-aid-to-education" and destroy local control of education. With local control gone, the NEA could then direct all educational processes by serving as the mouthpiece for the federal government.

The emphasis on class warfare as introduced by Givens has remained NEA's stock-in-trade over the years in its fight for "federal-aid-to-education." This was most evident in a brochure circulated in the 1960's by NEA's division of federal relations. The brochure ("The Root of Opposition to Federal Aid to Education," by John McCormally) said: "The fight over federal aid to education is, on the surface, a political fight, with spicy dashes of racial prejudice and religious bitterness thrown in.

"But under the surface, in reality, it is an economic battle – one of the oldest and hardest fought in this country. It falls in the classic pattern of historic battles between the haves and the have-nots, between those who control the wealth of the land and those who make up its masses.

"It is not popular – or even polite – to describe it in these terms. We are all brainwashed from childhood to pretend that the United States has no classes or masses, no sharp and fundamental disagreement between its have minority and have-not majority.

"We are all supposed to be of a mold – good, pert, freshly scrubbed Americans, believing that capitalism and free enterprise came down to us on stone tablets from the mountain and that democracy was devised by angels.

"And on the other hand, the majority, while it admits to something patriotic in the word 'capitalism,' particularly since it has become an antonym of 'communism,' nevertheless exerts most of its political energy – and has been doing so since the last century – controlling, curtailing, and transforming capitalism into some forms and stages of socialism.

"The first and greatest of these social programs – of channeling the wealth of the nation to the benefit of the masses – is the public school system.

"But free public education (radical as the idea was and still is to some untainted patriots), was for a long time no great economic threat. As long as it remained local, it could be controlled. The masses might fill the schools with their children; but the community leaders – its business and professional men – those concerned with preserving the community's wealth, controlled the schools. And they kept them inexpensive.

"This meant keeping them, in most cases, inadequate and crowded, with vastly underpaid and sadly undereducated and uninspired teachers. But it was cheap.

"But education feeds upon itself. Two generations ago, when utterly uneducated parents sent their children to school they were amazed, overjoyed, and endlessly grateful for the one-room building and $30 teachers which the local landowners in their magnanimity had provided them.

"A generation ago more parents had been through high school and some had been to college and they began to insist, for their children, on fireproof buildings and teachers with degrees and public high schools big enough for everyone.

"Now this generation, with vastly improved tastes, wants, in addition, pastel walls and multipurpose rooms, and foreign language and exceptional child programs, and teachers with two degrees, and public colleges big enough for everyone. And this is anything but cheap. So the fight has developed and grown . . . a fight between the people with the wealth and the people with the kids. And each time wealth won – each time it dug in its heels and threw up a line against more spending – the parents (ably commanded by professional educators) simply went around the end and started the fight all over again, in a larger arena.

"When district funds no longer sufficed because some districts were so poor in property and rich in children, the fight was made for county funds – for funneling wealth from the rich districts into the poor ones. And the next move was for the state funds – for funneling the wealth from the rich counties into the poor ones. And now the battle is for federal funds – for funneling the wealth from the rich states into the poor ones.

"But the change is more than geographic, more than just a move to larger taxing bases. The method of taxation changed too. The school district is limited to taxing real estate, no longer necessarily a true measure of wealth. But state and nation, with their sales and income taxes, are in much better position to stick the rich . . . .

"Familiar cries of combat warn of the dangers of federal control; although numbers increase who refuse to be terrified of their own government.

"The real battle involves no such principles. It is simply, unglamorously, a matter of money.

"The great mass of American people, whose children fill the schools, want more money spent on education – on teachers and facilities and subject matter which they believe, rightly or wrongly, will mean better, richer futures.

"Once public education has been made as much a federal responsibility as national defense or national highways, more money than was ever dreamed of will be spent on it. More than ever of the nation's wealth will be taken from those who possess it and spent on the education of the nation's children.

"That harsh, impolite economic truth is at the root of the opposition to federal aid to schools."

In 1957, at the NEA's centennial, Edgar B. Wesley wrote and published *NEA: The First Hundred Years.* Mr. Wesley, perhaps unwittingly, revealed that, early in the twentieth century, the NEA's leadership was class conscious and viewed the American scene as a struggle between the haves and the have-nots. He quoted an NEA resolution of 1908: "The public high schools should not be chiefly fitting schools for higher institutions, but should be adapted to the general needs, both intellectual and industrial, of their students and communities, and we suggest the higher institutions may wisely adapt their courses to this condition. The high schools must become the 'poor man's colleges,' because the amount of latent and dormant power; of wealth-discovering and wealth-producing energy; of beauty-loving and beauty-inspiring taste and skill, that lie concealed and slumbering in the brains and hearts of the keen, shrewd, capable, but untutored millions of our youth, is beyond computation."

The late Willmoore Kendall reviewed Wesley's book in *National Review* (September 7, 1957) under the appropriate heading: "Why Johnny Can't Do Nothing." Kendall made a perceptive analysis of the import of the 1908 resolution and what developed in the NEA's work after 1908. Kendall ridiculed Wesley's thesis that the NEA's history was one of achievements. He said of Wesley's book: "It should have been called, like Dreiser's novel, *An American Tragedy*; and it belongs on your bookshelf beside that other book in which stupid crimes and criminal stupidities are related as deeds to be proud of, namely: Rousseau's *Confessions.*"

Using Wesley's own words and interspersing his own observations, Kendall wrote of the NEA's corruption of high schools: "Victory, to be sure, did not come easily: as recently as 1900 Latin was 'exceeded in popularity as a high-school study only by algebra' – a state of affairs that 'reflected the persistence of the classical illusion and the power of . . . the dead hand from the tombs of culture.' For a while, indeed, it seemed possible that the country might 'indulge the anti-republican idea' of 'two systems of education, one for the ordinary citizen, . . . the other for the highly cultured few.' But, happily, the American people, 'freed from the domination of the academies, from the narrow theological dogmas that had pervaded the schools, and from the superstitious awe of the classics,' worked out 'their own educational salvation.' And the high schools were accordingly rescued from the absurd notion that 'whatever a pupil studied he should study thoroughly.' "

Kendall noted that once the high schools were converted from "chiefly fitting schools for higher institutions" to "poor man's colleges" by the NEA, new targets were approached: "Similar NEA actions fostered the normal schools and teachers' colleges, and made of them 'an integral part of the American pattern of public education.' Yet others, a little later, contributed to the establishment of departments of education in the nation's universities, stimulated the rapid multiplication of higher educational 'facilities' in general, and influenced the higher educational curriculum in the direction clearly indicated by the needs of American society. For the latter, Mr. Wesley tells us, has been 'too democratic to accept an aristocratic tradition, too competitive to tolerate one program however efficacious, too practical to be content with theoretical values, too intense to endure the arid drill of formal grammar, too impatient to wait for deferred values, too progressive to study outmoded languages, too nationalistic to acknowledge dependence upon foreign studies, too modern to be awed by ancient lore, too cosmopolitan to depend upon . . . small segments of its heritage . . . .'

"The NEA, in short, has spared no effort, neglected no project, that might hasten the transformation of our public school education into (what it is today) a continuous assault on the intellectual skills of the population.

"The 'seven subjects of the elementary program,' according to an NEA president speaking back in 1882, 'spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, grammar, and American history, [have] won their place by chance . . . . Neither arithmetic nor geography [throws] light upon the great moral, social, and political issues of the day.' But, exults Mr. Wesley, 'through the years both the curriculum and the process of making it changed fundamentally. The guidance of tradition, the influence of abstract principles, the weight of authority . . . gradually lost favor and were replaced by studies of the social setting, the principles of learning, and student capacities.' "

Colm Brogan, a British journalist, noted NEA's centennial in the *London Daily Telegraph* ("NEA: 100 Years of Progressive Failure," October 19, 1957). Brogan pinpointed the motivation of the NEA with sentiments similar to those of Willmoore Kendall: "The NEA is egalitarian. That is to say, it is and must be anti-intellectual. It assumes that, by the eternal order of nature or else by the special arrangements of the American Constitution, all children are created equal, with an equal right to life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness and such credit certificates as they may deem it convenient to acquire, without, in the process, learning anything particular about anything at all.

"The NEA has been particularly hostile to classical and academic learning, to an extent that has made the teaching of Latin seem like an un-American activity. This does not mean, however, that the NEA is devoted to the highly relevant disciplines of the materialistic present. Algebra is not favored, and one of the NEA's leaders, Mr. [Edgar B.] Wesley, considers that arithmetic and geography throw no light on the 'great moral, social and political issues of the day.'

"Naturally Mr. Wesley frowns on theological dogmas . . . . Mr. Wesley is also proud to claim that Americans are too nationalistic to think much of foreign studies which imply dependence on foreign cultures.

"The NEA's philosophers believe that if there is any subject which some children can do and some cannot do, then the subject should be thrown out of the curriculum; that subject is necessarily a relic of feudalism. One aggressive school of thought fights strongly against the superstition that all children should be taught to read and write, and there is no doubt that many American primary schools are singularly unsuperstitious.

"The powerhouse of the NEA's educational philosophy is the Teachers' College of Columbia University. Until recently, it took considerable courage for any educationist to make a public stand against Columbia, but there are signs that the tide is beginning to turn."

Brogan then engaged in some optimistic speculations which thus far have proven unwarranted: "Many parents are not only angry at what Johnny is not taught, but at what he is taught. 'Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that in the United States, as in other countries, the age of individualism and *laissez-faire* in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.' This statement from a report sponsored by the NEA is very far from the taste of the ordinary American, who would like to know if collectivism has taken the place of arithmetic in the classroom.

"It is perhaps fortunate for his blood pressure that the ordinary American did not see the NEA yearbook which described the Communist leader Earl Browder as 'an able and restrained radical.' Anyone who is honestly looking for an explanation of 'McCarthyism' has not far to seek.

"Dr. [George S.] Counts of the NEA has publicly said that the schools should train children for the collectivist society that is now emerging. 'You will say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative, or at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me.'

"But it frightens most of the taxpayers and they are beginning to show their feelings. It goes without saying that not all American state primary schools are as bad as the NEA would like them to be. There are many practical-minded and sensible teachers in these schools who are anxious to do a useful day's work if only their supervisors will allow them . . . .

"As a pressure group, the NEA is no less formidable than the Methodists or the Roman Catholics, but it looks as if the NEA might soon begin to learn the old rule of physics that action and reaction are equal and opposite. In short, this body has gone considerably too far and may well have less cause for self-congratulation on its second centenary – if it survives as long as that, which is more than doubtful."

Although the NEA has, since at least 1934, been actively promoting a socialist or collectivist society, it has managed to weather strong criticisms and devastating exposures and it has continued to increase its influence and power. There have been many incidents along the way which, under normal circumstances, would be reasonably expected to have seriously impaired NEA's growth.

The 1954 House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations called attention to NEA's sponsorship of the *Building America* series of textbooks. The *Building America* series was written by Harold O. Rugg, one of the most prominent disciples of John Dewey. Rugg's pro-Socialist bias had been plainly evidenced in his 1933 *The Great Technology,* a guide for teachers. Rugg advised teachers that the United States must have a government with all-pervading powers to plan and run the lives of the people and the nation's economy. The teachers' role would be to prepare "a new public mind" for a "new social order." He posed the question to teachers: "Can independent ways of living be carried on any longer on an irresponsible competitive basis? Must not central public control be imposed on the warring, self-aggrandizing captains of industry? Can this control be set up with the consent of a large minority of the people quickly enough to forestall the imposition of dictatorship either by business leaders or by an outraged proletarian agriculture bloc, which seems imminent?"

Rugg was financed with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to write a series of pamphlets which eventually became the *Building America* textbook series. The NEA became the major promotional source for the series, and by 1940, more than five million copies of the series were being used in America's public schools. The first major opposition to the series came in California where, in 1947, the State Board of Education, upon the recommendation of the State Curriculum Commission, adopted the series as supplementary textbooks. A panel appointed by the San Francisco Board of Education found that Rugg's books promoted the thesis that "it is one of the functions of the schools, indeed it appears at the time to be the chief function, to plan the future of society." The panel reported: "Moreover, the books contain a constant emphasis on our national defects. Certainly we should think it a great mistake to picture our nation as perfect or flawless either in its past or in its present, but it is our conviction that these books give a decidedly distorted impression through overstressing weaknesses and injustices. They therefore tend to weaken the student's love for his country, respect for its past and confidence in its future."

California's Senate Investigating Committee on Education reported that the *Building America* series do "not present a true historical background of American history and progress . . . the cartoons and pictures in said books belittle American statesmen, who have been . . . heroes of tradition and . . . idealized by the American people; yet . . . the *Building America* series glamorizes Russian statesmen and [is] replete with Russian thought . . . . [The] books contain purposely distorted references favoring Communism, and life in Soviet Russia . . . . " Citing a cartoon in one of the books that showed Abraham Lincoln burying the Constitution, the Committee charged: "Nothing so vividly illustrates the change in attitude of some of our national educational leaders in some policy-forming positions of the National Education Association of professional educators and teachers as this about-face toward the memory of Abraham Lincoln who lived and labored 'that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.' " As a result of the Committee's work, the State of California banned the NEA's *Building America* series.

Another book sponsored by the NEA to be used by social science teachers as an officially-approved teaching guide was *The American Way of Business*, by Abba P. Lerner and Oscar Lange. (Lerner was a Socialist; Lange, a Communist, who renounced his American citizenship to become a top government official in Communist Poland.) The book was financed by the Rockefeller Foundation and was, in effect, a Communist blueprint for converting the American economic system into totalitarianism with a Marxist brand. The teaching "guide" was replete with denunciations of private enterprise and advocacies of statism: "Public enterprise must become a major constituent of our economy, if we are really going to have economic prosperity." – "It is necessary to have public ownership of banking and credit (investment banks and insurance companies)." – "The idea of abolishing private enterprise came from socialist thinkers who believed that this change would actually further the development and freedom of the individual." – "A publicly owned banking and credit system alone is compatible with the flexibility of capital value necessary to maintain competitive standards in production and trade." – " . . . It is necessary to have public ownership of monopolistic key industries . . . . The legal basis for public ownership of such industries should be provided by an amendment to the anti-trust laws, providing that in cases of proved repetition of monopolistic practices and impossibility of correcting the situation on the basis of private enterprise, the companies in question should be transferred into public ownership and operated on the 'principle of public service.' " – "It is necessary to have public ownership of basic natural resources (mines, oil fields, timber, coal, etc.)." – " . . . In order to insure that the public corporations act in accordance with the competitive 'rules of the game,' a special economic court (enjoying the same independence as the courts of justice) might be established . . . and that the economic court be given the power to repeal any rules of Congress, of legislatures, or of the municipal councils . . . . "

In 1948, the NEA, through several of its departments, produced a book, *Education for International Understanding,* financed by the Carnegie Corporation and NEA members' contributions. The foreword was written by Warren Austin, the chief American representative at the UN. The book was tendered by the NEA to serve as a guide to teachers so that they might indoctrinate their pupils with a belief in the merits of internationalism.

The 1954 Special House Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations reported on the NEA's volume: "There is a grave question in the minds of this Committee whether this powerful organization of teachers has any right to attempt to promote a uniform program of education on a national basis; but, if such a procedure is proper, it might well be that planning to educate our children into a better understanding of the world and its component parts and how international things work might be highly desirable. The program of the NEA, however, as expressed in the book under discussion, went far further than a mere educational program. It assumed that because the United Nations had been accepted as an intrinsic part of American foreign policy it should receive virtually unqualified and uncritical support.

"The fact is that while the United Nations does play an intrinsic part in our foreign policy, support among our citizens for its mechanism and the detailed actions of its various constituents, boards and bodies is far from universal. The intelligent observer cannot escape the conclusion that the agencies of the United Nations themselves in many instances have promoted ideas and concepts which seem antithetical to many of our own basic principles.

"We find in Mr. Austin's preface, for example, reference to the necessity for 'rationalization of production and distribution on a world-wide basis.' It is suggested that 'solution of economic problems on a purely national basis without regard to the effect of their conduct on other peoples and nations breeds economic war.' That may well be but there are many in the United States who believe that our efforts to improve the world's economy at enormous cost to the American taxpayer have not only been ineffective but have been met with a universal egocentric response by the other nations. The general tone of the volume is that we must sacrifice a considerable part of our national independence in order to create a stable and peaceful world. That may also be true if and when the time comes when most of the nations of the world will be ready themselves for honest international collaboration. In the meantime, to train our children into the desirability of becoming internationalists at a time when world society is characterized by the most intense kind of selfish nationalism seems both unrealistic and dangerous.

"The volume implies that the creation of the United Nations is only the first step in the establishment of a world order. Its adulation of the United Nations itself is almost childish. In the face of our difficulties with Russia it says: 'Through its Security Council, every dispute that affects the peace of the world can be brought before an international body endowed with authority to take all necessary steps for the restraint of aggression.' To impose this concept upon our children in the schools is to teach them nonsense. The futility of the United Nations in settling international disputes has been tragically evident. And this futility, moreover, is not the result of a failure on our part to be 'international minded.'

" 'Collaboration' is emphasized in this volume. We are to collaborate with all the various UNO bureaus and agencies, even the Commission on Human Rights.

"The volume emphasizes the responsibility of teachers for 'contributing to the maintenance of enduring peace.' This is to be accomplished by indoctrinating our children with the desirability of full cooperation with the UNO and all its works. 'This will certainly involve curriculum revision and the recasting of many time-honored educational policies and practices. It is a case in which half-measures and lip-service will not be adequate, for if these are the substance of the effort, the challenge will go unanswered.' The goal is set as producing citizens who might be called 'world-minded Americans.' We cannot escape the conclusion that what is meant is the production of advocates of a world state.

"Again, we say that someday a world state may be desirable and possible. However, we are living in a very realistic era in which 'one world' could only be accomplished by succumbing to Communism. The program suggested contains this specific identification of the 'world-minded American': 'The world-minded American knows that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace and that nations must cooperate to achieve peace and human progress.'

"On page 21 of this volume we find this astounding statement ' . . . More recently, the idea has become established that the preservation of international peace and order may require that force be used to compel a nation to conduct its affairs within the framework of an established world system. The most modern expression of this doctrine of collective security is in the United Nations Charter.'

"On page 31 we find this: ' . . . The social causes of war are overwhelmingly more important than the attitudes and behavior of individuals. If this be true, the primary approach to the prevention of war must involve action in the area of social and political organization and control.'

"Education is the recommended road to 'social and political organization and control' and education is described 'as a force for conditioning the will of a people . . . . It utilizes old techniques and mass media such as the printed word, the cinema, the radio, and now television.' If we read these terms correctly they seem to mean to us that the educators are to use all the techniques of propaganda in order to condition our children to the particular variety of 'world-mindedness' which these educators have adopted. Considerable space is later spent for 'education for peace through mass media.'

"There is constant repetition of the idea that 'the world-minded American believes that unlimited national sovereignty is a threat to world peace.' On page 44 we find: ' . . . Many persons believe that enduring peace cannot be achieved so long as the nation-state system continues as at present constituted. It is a system of international anarchy – a species of jungle warfare. Enduring peace cannot be attained until the nation-states surrender to a world organization the exercise of jurisdiction over those problems with which they have found themselves unable to deal singly in the past. If like conditions continue in the future as in the past, like situations will arise. Change the conditions, and the situations will change.'

"Again, on page 46, we find this: 'We are likely to take the present nation-state system for granted; but in so doing, we are likely to overestimate its permanence and underestimate its significance . . . . '

"There is a definite call to political action or at least to a promotion of the idea that we must surrender some of our political independence. On page 57 we find this: ' . . . The demonstration of the feasibility of international organization in nonpolitical fields and the failure of the League of Nations makes even more clear the fact that it is in the area of "political" organization where failure seems to be consistent. This suggests that the difficulty may be traceable to the dogma of unlimited sovereignty – that nothing must be allowed to restrict the complete independence of the state. It suggests also that the dogma of sovereignty has a high emotional content that is self-generated and self-sustained and that so long as the dogma of illimitability obtains, international cooperation of a political nature will at best be tenuous.'

"On page 60 we find this recommendation that we must conform our national economic policies to an international world economy: ' . . . The development of international cooperation as a contributing force to economic well-being is possible only insofar as it is applied to give direction to common positive aims and to condition the effects of national economic policies that would otherwise be serious disruptions of the interdependent world economy.'

"We must have (page 62) a 'planned economic cooperation on a world-wide scale.'

"Our children are not merely to be educated into international points of view – they are told how to make themselves effective in creating political pressure. We offer these quotations as examples: Page 80: '. . . An individual can increase his effectiveness in influencing foreign policy by associating himself with organizations and by helping to formulate their attitudes on international questions. The groups most suitable for this purpose are the political party and those generally called pressure groups.'

"Page 81: '. . . The world-minded American, as a part of his program of action, should concern himself with how these groups operate. He will find that he himself can probably have a greater influence through this technique. He will also find that since a great deal of official action is determined by pressure group action, the use of this device will enable him to be heard and will also enable him to urge his interest for peace against those he considers to be urging a contrary interest. He will find that the variety and interests of the groups with which he can affiliate are endless; and he must, therefore, examine carefully the aims of the group or groups to which he will devote his energies.'

"Page 82: '. . . Teachers must act. As citizens, their obligation to act on behalf of peace and international cooperation is a responsibility shared with all other citizens. But teachers cannot be content merely to do just as much as others; they must do more. Teachers in almost any American community have greater competence in leadership skills and in knowledge than most of their fellow citizens. With greater capacity goes greater responsibility for bringing personal influence to bear on civic action on the local, State, and National levels.'

"The school is to be a sort of militant agent so that 'the total impact of community thinking may be brought to bear on major issues. Such a role brings the school into working contact with those agencies in the community which are keyed to action . . . .'

"The schools are told how 'to assume their responsibility.' Programs are to be developed rapidly. School planning committees are to pool ideas and coordinate. 'Aids and sources' are recommended, including reading materials, films and film strips, etc. A list of books are recommended and among them we find some the advisability of [whose] recommendations we seriously doubt.

"Putting the evidence together, we conclude that the National Education Association has been an important element in the tax-exempt world used to indoctrinate American youth with 'internationalism,' the particular variety which Professor [Kenneth] Colgrove referred to as 'globalism.' This point of view is closely related to the 'new era' which so many social scientists have envisioned as the ultimate goal of our society when they have gotten through 'engineering' us into it.

"We note that the filed statement by the National Education Association has made no effort to explain any of the criticisms made of that organization in the testimony, including the material we have just treated on globalism. This crucial and well documented issue is completely evaded with the remark that the NEA is 'unable to learn whether any of the previous testimony is regarded by your Committee as worthy of further examination.' The following characterization disposes of the evidence itself: 'This testimony, insofar as we have been able to examine it, is so vague and so self-contradictory, that detailed comment seems unnecessary.' We beg to differ with the NEA."

The NEA's association with the United Nations has grown stronger over the years. In effect, the NEA serves as a courier carrying UN propaganda to teachers and students. The NEA publishes and distributes books and pamphlets in praise of the UN, conducts "group educational tours to the UN," maintains an observer at the UN, and sponsors radio and TV programs and visual-aid productions glorifying the UN.

The major concern of the NEA since the days of the New Deal and down to the present time has been federal subsidization and control of public school education. The NEA has admitted that it hopes to see the establishment of a National Board of Education with members "appointed for long overlapping terms by the President with the consent of the Senate, as an independent agency to administer the United States Office of Education." The NEA has advanced the idea that a national board would "provide appropriate, non-partisan, federal leadership in meeting educational problems of nationwide concern." Of course, any such national board would be composed of educators recommended by the NEA. To achieve its long-range goal, the NEA established a formal lobby in 1956. (The *New York Times* of July 4, 1956 described it as "the greatest education lobby ever seen in this country," prepared to mobilize local, state and national educational organizations behind "a concerted drive to influence Congress to support school legislation.") The operating policy of the lobby has been stated bluntly: "The National Education Association reaffirms its belief that the federal government has a shared responsibility with states and local communities to insure adequate educational opportunities for all."

Various observers have noted that the NEA's lobbying efforts operate from a tremendous power base. Russell Kirk wrote (*National Review,* December 6, 1958): "The power of the NEA and its state affiliates remains great . . . . They control, indirectly, most of the important appointments in the university departments of education, the teachers' colleges, the big schools, and the little schools. They are a formidable pressure-group upon Congress and every state legislature. They have nearly every state superintendent of public instruction and state board of education twisted round their little fingers."

Dan Smoot wrote (*The Dan Smoot Report,* October 25, 1965): "The NEA works closely with the U.S. Office of Education – so closely, in fact, that U.S. Commissioners of Education sometimes appear unable to function without NEA approval. For example, when Dr. Sterling M. McMurrin resigned as U.S. Commissioner of Education in September, 1962 (after serving slightly more than one year), the press attributed his resignation to the fact that he could not get along with the NEA. About 950,000 of the 1,700,000 public school teachers in America are members of the NEA; but Dr. McMurrin says the NEA is not responsive to its membership, which is manipulated into rubber-stamping policies and resolutions prepared by a small group of NEA executives. He accuses the NEA of dominating state education associations, and charges that the NEA 'is not interested in higher education, is cool to the private schools, and is pathologically opposed to the parochial schools.' Before resigning as U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. McMurrin told William G. Carr, head of the NEA: 'You and I head up the biggest bureaucracies in Washington. NEA has all of the bureaucratic shortcomings and is in danger of moving toward national control of education, not by the Federal Government but by the NEA.' "

The NEA's lobby would not, of course, be anywhere near as powerful without its large number of members and their dues, which finance the lobby. As Dr. McMurrin indicated, the NEA is not responsive to its members; it leads them and it can afford to do so since NEA holds a virtual monopoly on public school teachers whose membership, although not technically compulsory, is almost necessary in many school systems. Dan Smoot rightly observed in his October 1965 report that "the NEA operates as a gigantic union which virtually forces membership on many teachers, which assumes authority to bargain with school boards about policies, which uses teachers' strikes and boycotts to force school districts, communities, or entire states to comply with NEA wishes. Compelling teachers to join the NEA against their will is done subtly, indirectly. Since most public school administrators belong to the NEA, many teachers feel that NEA membership is an unspoken, unwritten, unofficial – but necessary – requirement for employment." Earlier, Russell Kirk had made similar observations in his *National Review* article: "The NEA officers . . . would be delighted at the prospect of compulsory membership, I am sure. They already practice what amounts to a CIO-automobile-plant checkoff system in the schools; in some others, superintendents insert into teachers' contracts a provision that the signatories must agree to join the NEA or its state affiliate . . . . If the NEA were a really free association, headed by scholars, it could do a great deal toward the reform of our schooling. But it is something different: an arbitrary lobby headed by a clique of doctrinaire administrators and 'executive secretaries.' "

No matter how often the NEA's leaders insist that the NEA is not a union, its members behave in the same manner as union members. They have strikes and walkouts, usually described as professional holidays. They participate in collective bargaining, which is euphemistically called professional negotiations. They boycott school systems through the device of sanctions.

There is no doubt that the union-like behavior of teachers is dictated from NEA headquarters. In 1962, the NEA's Classroom Teachers National Study Conference set a policy for "professional negotiations" and "sanctions": "Professional education associations have the right to participate with boards of education in decision making . . . regarding personnel practices, working conditions, fringe and nonwage benefits, salaries, employment standards, inservice education of personnel, class size, teacher turnover, communications within the school system, curriculum planning, and teaching methods.

"Sanctions are a means to impel an object toward moral action. In education it is moral that a community should support its schools; that school boards will discharge their functions with integrity and impartiality; that administrators will use the procedures essential for the democratic administration of good schools; that teachers will make every reasonable effort to provide the best possible learning experiences for students. Against those who are immoral by this standard, teacher organizations may impose sanctions."

In 1964, sanctions were imposed on all of Utah's public schools by NEA's state affiliate in a dispute over teachers' salaries. In 1965, the NEA's state affiliate in Oklahoma, in a salary dispute, imposed sanctions on all of the state's public schools and urged out-of-state teachers to boycott Oklahoma. And in 1965, NEA struck out its policy forbidding strikes.

By 1967, strikes of state and city school systems had become epidemic. The most widely publicized strike occurred in Florida, where more than one-third of the state's public school teachers resigned in a salary dispute, creating chaos throughout the entire state. In 1967, however, the NEA had virtually shed its pretence of not being a union. The NEA's annual convention adopted by its Board of Directors stated: "The NEA recognizes that under conditions of severe stress, causing deterioration of the educational program, and when good faith attempts at resolution have been rejected, strikes have occurred and may occur in the future. In such instances, the NEA will offer all of the services at its command to the affiliate concerned to help resolve the impasse . . . . The NEA recommends that every effort be made to avoid the strike as a procedure for the resolution of the impasse." The NEA's executive secretary stated: "The NEA will not encourage strikes, but if one occurs after all good faith efforts fail, we will not walk out on our members." Other NEA officials explained that strikers would be supported with money, legal services, and the use of experienced field representatives. In February 1968, the NEA boasted that its affiliates had participated in fifty-six strikes during the previous twelve months.

In November 1967, a former NEA executive, writing in the *NEA Reporter,* served a warning that the NEA intended to continue exerting its power: "The current turmoil in teaching, the exhibition of teacher aggressiveness and militancy, as disturbing as it all may seem to some, are but the preludes to the relevancy of tomorrow . . . . This bright future will bring life-giving freshness of rarefied air in the bright sunshine of a new world of education . . . . " He also noted that the NEA was the largest "specialized group in American life. There is wrapped up in that assertion the power to move education forward, a power so vast as to stagger the imagination . . . [a power to] change society against the will of politicians." Sam Lambert, NEA's executive secretary, on October 20, 1967, boasted: "We are already four times as large as any other professional organization in this country . . . . Within a few years we will be six or seven times as large . . . . NEA is going to put its power and influence to work for the things that are most important . . . . [It] will become a stronger and more influential advocate of social changes long overdue . . . . NEA will become a political power second to no other special-interest group . . . . NEA will insist that the profession at all levels have a voice in the formulation of educational policy, in curriculum change, and in educational planning . . . . [NEA] will continue to serve as a sounding board for teacher opinion and as a voice for the teachers on every important issue . . . . NEA will have more and more to say about how the teacher is educated, whether he should be admitted to the profession, and, depending upon his behavior and ability, whether he should stay in the position . . . . NEA will organize this profession from top to bottom into logical operational units that can move swiftly and effectively and with power unmatched by any other organized group."

Lambert, as executive secretary and the guiding genius of NEA, is not content to have NEA the behemoth of professional unions. He fully intends that the NEA shall determine how all government appropriations will be spent. He has admitted (*NEA Journal*, December 1967) that the "federal establishment has sliced out for itself leadership in the field of innovation, in the belief that the education establishment is traditional [*sic*], conservative [*sic*], and incapable of change without being pushed or shown how . . . . It is true that the education establishment needs at least a little nudging toward research and innovation, but the basic arguments between NEA and the federal establishment are over whether we need a limited or total war on the problems of education and over who should make the decision on what is really important." But, although Lambert was willing to allow the federal government to be a financial partner, he said that the "local and state governments will seek and get the right to decide how the federal government's money should be spent." All of which meant that the NEA, through its powerful political pressure on state and local governments, would decide how all governmental monies – national, state, and local – would be spent.

Lambert's position was anticipated five years earlier by an editorial writer for the *Chicago Sun-Times,* who recounted an instance of NEA pressure upon a college and what the pressure tactics signified: "The *Sun-Times'* opposition to Federal aid for elementary and secondary public schools has been based on the conviction that Federal control is inherent in Federal aid.

"We cling to the belief, old-fashioned as it may be, that parents have a right to exercise some control over the education of their children. We doubt they could do so if ultimate control were lodged in a vast Federal bureaucracy in Washington.

"That the National Education Association, composed of professional educators, advocates Federal aid has surprised us at times. But no longer. For control – real control over the education of the Nation's children – is being shifted rapidly to the NEA. That organization has about completed the job of cartelizing public school education under its own auspices.

"It is doing so through an organization known as the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, an agency whose governing council is tightly NEA controlled.

" . . . The NEA is usurping parental prerogatives by determining the type of education offered. It is all very simple: control the education and hiring of teachers.

"This is what the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education . . . has set out to do and what, to a considerable extent, it has accomplished. Most public school administrators belong to NEA. Increasingly public school administrators hire only teachers who have received their training in NCATE-approved institutions.

"The absurd result of this policy is illustrated by the Carleton College episode. Without doubt, Carleton, located at Northfield, Minn., is one of the Nation's outstanding colleges. Academically, it probably has no superior.

"Yet NCATE initially refused to approve Carleton's program for teacher education. Carleton is a liberal arts college. Its students receive fine training in the humanities and in other areas which make for a well-rounded person. Its emphasis is on education in the best sense of the word. It provides a minimum education in teaching methods, an area of study on which NCATE places its emphasis.

"Carleton was refused NCATE accreditation. But teachers colleges whose faculties were far less renowned, whose libraries and other essential academic facilities were far inferior, were approved. They were approved because their curriculums contained a preponderance of courses having to do with methods of teaching. Their students were required to take courses in methods at the expense of acquainting themselves with the subject they were going to teach.

"Carleton refused to be traduced. It insisted that education in content was more important than education in teaching methods. It believed that a knowledge of history was more important to a history teacher than a knowledge of procedure and methods. It didn't contend procedures and methods were unimportant. It merely contended they were of secondary importance.

"Carleton's refusal to knuckle under resulted in NCATE capitulation insofar as Carleton was concerned. But many fine colleges throughout the Nation do not have Carleton's resources or Carleton's prestige. They have to knuckle under, otherwise their students who wish to be teachers would have difficulty getting jobs, the NEA cartel being what it is. So the NEA is now dictating to colleges what they will teach.

"Teacher certification is a power lodged in each State. But a certificate without a job doesn't do a teacher much good.

"NEA has no apprehension regarding Federal control of public schools as a consequence of Federal aid. It has control itself. It is extending that control over colleges and universities. In the NEA scheme of things it will be a simple matter to extend control over whatever Washington agency handles the funds. [Emphasis added.]

"Professional organizations and accrediting agencies have their proper places. But when they become masters rather than servants of people who hire their members they have gone too far."

In recent years, the NEA during its annual conventions has adopted ever wider-ranging resolutions urging total federal support for all facets of education and for various sociological experiments and extravagances on the fringe of education. Resolutions have also been made on political issues and other issues which reflect the socialist-paternalist-statist convictions of NEA leaders, who, in the words of executive secretary Sam Lambert, serve "as a voice for the teachers on every important issue." Recent resolutions have read: "*Federal Support of Public Education*: The NEA seeks federal support of public education in line with the following principles and in full compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. (a) That there be substantial general federal support of the whole of public education. (b) That present federal programs of specific aids be continued, expanded, and improved by consolidation, simplified administration and reporting, and that their evaluation be primarily a state and local responsibility. (c) That further expansion, related to federal support to education, be general in nature, and that these funds be allocated without federal control to state education agencies to supplement and to be used as state public education funds. (d) That the amount of aid be generally predictable for long-range planning and specifically predictable for year-to-year planning. (e) That distribution of the federal funds within states permit the same administrative discretion as for state public education funds. (f) That expenditure of the federal funds be only for the purposes for which the states and localities, under their constitutions and statutes, may expend their own public education funds. (g) That the legislation be consistent with the constitutional provision respecting an establishment of religion and with the tradition of separation of church and state. (h) That the legislation contain provision for judicial review as to its constitutionality. (i) That all federally supported educational programs, including those now assigned to other federal agencies (except those programs designed to train armed forces personnel), be administered by a Cabinet Department of Education and, pending the establishment of such a Department, by the U.S. Office of Education.

"The Association urges its officers, directors, affiliates, and Legislative Commission to develop, seek, and continuously review legislative programs to realize these principles and report any irregularities in the expenditures of such funds to the U.S. Office of Education or such other agencies as may have authority to make necessary corrections.

"The NEA urges its members and affiliates to seek from their members of Congress an annual general assistance grant to education of six billion dollars."

On *Urban Educational Problems*: "The special problems of American urban areas present a severe challenge to all public agencies, especially the public schools. In view of the expanding urbanization of American life, the fate of urban areas is increasingly the concern of all Americans. Urban problems, therefore, call for urgent attention from the associations of the teaching profession.

"The efforts of educators to deal with these problems have been impressive in size and intensity. The fact must be faced, however, that these efforts have not generally succeeded. Teachers continue to be of low morale. Classes persist in being too large for effective services to pupils whose needs are especially great. Administrators are harassed by conflicting pressures and inadequate means.

"Among the many grievous problems now plaguing American cities, none is greater or more difficult to solve than the de facto segregation which is presently increasing in nearly all of the major cities. Today, despite great effort, many of the inner city schools are providing inadequate education. The Association believes that these schools should receive higher-than-average funds to provide increases in staff and instructional materials to carry out present programs and more compensatory education.

"In addition, the Association believes that education must transcend present patterns of urban school organization, programs, and staff. While not abandoning the concept of the neighborhood school, the Association calls for bold experimentation with pupil transportation, specialized schools of high quality, educational parks, and metropolitan-area school districts. To attract teachers with the highest professional qualifications and to meet the needs of the urban child calls for high salary schedules and economic benefits, a wide variety of supporting services, and more equipment and instructional materials.

"All schools need greater resources. To enable urban schools to meet their responsibility requires a massive financial investment by city, state, and national governments. The Association calls upon state and local affiliates to lead in developing such programs and directs its officers and staff to become deeply involved with all agencies concerned, to supply needed research, and to seek appropriate legislation.

"To promote cross-racial experiences which are an essential part of the education program of every pupil, the Association urges all 50 states to act in good faith in applying the guidelines for desegregation issued by the U.S. Office of Education."

On *Teachers and National Service*: "The NEA urges that the Selective Service System, in order more nearly to assure reasonable and logical continuity in the education of citizens, delay to the end of the school year the induction of those teachers who are drafted during the year. Teachers so drafted, or who volunteer, should be guaranteed contract renewal, continued tenure, salary increments, service credit toward retirement, and all other benefits that would accrue if they continued in their positions with their school systems.

"The Association also believes that service in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), and the Teacher Corps represents a contribution to the nation.

"The Association urges that state and local boards of education grant to all teachers who have served in these groups teacher service credit up to five years for purposes of salary, tenure, and retirement."

On the *District of Columbia*: "The NEA supports home rule for the District of Columbia which will safeguard the rights of citizens of the District of Columbia by enabling them better to discharge their obligations for the education of their children. Essential components of home rule are adequate financing for the schools provided from a fair share of annual federal appropriations; a fiscally independent school board; and protection of professional employees' rights, such as tenure, salary, leave, retirement, and fringe benefits."

On *A Nation Under Law*: "The NEA believes that civil order and obedience to law must be ensured in our communities and schools, without losing sight of and respect for human rights.

"The Association believes that citizens, working together, can find constructive, nonviolent solutions to problems that torture civilized countries today. The principle of obedience to laws that are made with the consent and participation of the governed is the foundation of our democracy. This concept is predicated on the belief in majority rule with the right of the minority peacefully and forcefully to dissent. It is also the citizens' duty to work actively to change laws that abridge the rights of man.

"While requiring obedience to law, the nation should provide judicial machinery and free legal counsel which ensures the poor and destitute speedy and equal justice under the law."

On *Voting at Eighteen*: "The NEA believes that the learning and participation of youth in the democratic life of school prepares them for responsible citizenship. The Association recommends that the right to vote be granted to citizens at the age of eighteen."

On *Fair Housing*: "The NEA believes that fair housing practices will do much to alleviate environmental conditions detrimental to the education of our youth. We believe universal fair housing practices will aid in bringing about a truly universal public education.

"We commend those communities which have taken positive steps to correct existing deficiencies in housing practices and urge all local associations, in cooperation with community agencies, to develop and promote practicable programs to implement fair housing practices in every community.

"We further call upon legislatures of the states, commonwealths, and members of Congress to provide forward-looking legislation which will assure each citizen an equal opportunity to reside in a neighborhood of his choice."

Some of the NEA's resolutions would make it appear that Americans have systematically neglected public schools ("many schools are in crisis, evidenced by decay, neglect, and continuing deterioration"). In a 1969 resolution, under the heading "educational opportunity for all," the NEA indicated that there are no limits to its ambitions to guide the lives of the American people: " . . . Education should be provided from early childhood *through adulthood,* be suited to the needs of the individual, be nonsegregated, be offered *beyond the traditional school day and school year,* be offered at public expense, and be *required* through the secondary school." [Emphasis added.]

In March 1969, the NEA held a special conference in Washington, D.C. The main topic under discussion was "Dealing with Extremist Attacks." Those invited to the conference were warned that "extremist attacks on education are growing. The curricula of schools have been curtailed or eliminated in five communities and the extremists are particularly active in 14 states."

Human Events (March 1, 1969) added a revealing footnote to the conference: "Encouraged by this apparently new outlook of the NEA's, *Human Events* contacted spokesman Paul Putnam to find out just who some of the speakers might be. Who, for instance, would speak on the Black Panthers, the Black Students Union, the Communist party, the SDSers and all the other left-wing groups attempting to seize the schools?

" 'Well,' Mr. Putnam explained, 'the conference isn't really going to deal with these groups – though it may at some future and undetermined date.' For the real threat the conference hopes to expose is that favorite bogeyman of the NEA, the 'far right.'

"These 'extremists,' according to literature handed out through Putnam's office, have been engaged in such terrible demonstrations like 'mass mailings to teachers attacking their professional education associations' and trying to prevent schools from 'adopting a curriculum on Family Life and Sex Education.' Moreoever, they have been successful in 'some communities' in curbing these courses.

"In order to alert the public to these dangerous doings, the NEA has scheduled a number of special 'far right watchers' for the conference, including Wesley McCune, director of Group Research, Inc., and Jerome H. Bakst, director of research and evaluation for the Anti-Defamation League."

The NEA was not above indulging in extremism. In November 1969, NEA's President George D. Fischer threw all the prestige of the NEA into the controversy surrounding the nomination of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the Supreme Court of the United States. Fischer charged the Nixon Administration with selling out to racism. Fischer attacked Haynsworth's record in civil rights cases, but failed to mention any specific cases and merely offered the unsubstantiated allegation that, on the circuit court bench, Haynsworth resorted to racist tactics. As spokesman for the entire NEA membership, Fischer insisted that "the rights of every school child could be abridged by his [Haynsworth's] nomination."

In July 1970, when Fischer was completing his presidency, he warned the NEA's membership that there was "a conspiracy" against education and urged teachers to form a political group to combat it. "There are some experts in America who are predicting that public education cannot survive the onslaughts leveled against it in 1970," he said. "There appears to be a conspiracy at work to destroy confidence in public education, including a hostile federal administration which has in fact declared war on education." Fischer included within the "conspiracy" President Richard Nixon, racist governors, a new coalition of private segregated schools, and profit-making businesses which offer to teach reading in public schools on contracts promising to raise pupil achievement to specific levels.

Fischer's ambition against the "conspiracy" was to have the NEA, within five years, include every public school teacher: "I will not be satisfied until we are the most powerful lobby in the nation."

Fischer's successor as NEA president is Helen Pate Bain, who in her inaugural address said that she had five priorities for her term in office: (1) a professional negotiation law in every state to lessen the necessity for strikes by teachers; (2) laws in every state to provide "teachers autonomy. We must control our own profession"; (3) a fight for adequate financing for schools; (4) support for "meaningful and significant" student involvement; and (5) creation of effective human relations centers in the communities.

[UNITED STATES] NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

In August 1946, twenty-five American students were delegates to the World Student Congress, held in Prague, Czecho-Slovakia. The Congress was held under the auspices of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, an international Communist front. Out of the proceedings of the Congress emerged the International Union of Students, which from its inception was in the absolute control of Communists.

The American students who attended the Communist-controlled get-together in Prague collectively "could see the profound need for a forum of American student leadership, a body through which international representation and information could be maintained." They organized as the Committee for the Chicago Student Conference.

In December 1946, students from two hundred colleges and various youth organizations attended a conference at the University of Chicago convoked by the Committee for the Chicago Student Conference. At the conclusion of the conference, a Continuations Committee was delegated to draft a constitution and schedule a constitutional convention for a new student organization.

In 1947, at the University of Wisconsin, the National Student Association was founded. Delegates from more than three hundred colleges and universities adopted a constitution. The preamble to the NSA Constitution said: "We, the students of the United States of America, desiring to maintain academic freedom, academic responsibility and student rights; to stimulate and improve democratic student government; to develop better educational standards, facilities and teaching methods; to improve student cultural, social and physical welfare; to promote international understanding and fellowship; to guarantee to all people, because of their inherent dignity as individuals, equal rights and possibilities for primary, secondary and higher education regardless of sex, race, religion, political belief or economic circumstance; to foster the recognition of the rights and responsibilities of students to the school, the community, humanity and God; and to preserve the interests and integrity of the government and Constitution of the United States of America; do hereby establish this Constitution of the United States National Student Association."

In a 1961 NSA publication, *Toward a Better Understanding,* the national staff stated that "the USNSA is not a political pressure group of 'leftist,' 'rightist,' or other political bias. It is a student government confederation of three hundred and ninety-nine colleges and universities whose student bodies are represented through their democratically constituted student governments" and organized to achieve the ideals in the NSA's constitutional preamble. "USNSA seeks to achieve the . . . ideals by: (1) Serving member student governments with material and information on problems of student government operation such as orientation systems, honor systems, administrative techniques, finances, and hundreds of other daily problems that student governments face through the facilities of the Student Government Information Service.

"(2) Promoting citizenship education in the American student community through a series of conferences and publications designed to promote democratic student governments on every American college campus which foster an appreciation of the functioning and complexities of the democratic system of government.

"(3) Training students in the techniques of democratic leadership through a series of conferences and publications on the national and regional levels that have direct application on every campus.

"(4) Promoting an increased understanding of the nature and function of the university in modern society by a series of conferences and publications designed to stimulate thought on the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty to one another and to society and the functions of what is known as academic freedom, its limitations and its possibilities.

"(5) Increasing the quality of student participation in extra-curricular activities of all types – social, governmental, religious, and educational – and securing an increased student participation and responsibility in the operation of their universities through representation on faculty and administrative boards, course evaluation committees, curricular study and evaluation programs.

"(6) Securing student representation on leading national educational policy-making bodies in higher education in order that students might be given more consideration and opportunity to participate in the formulation of educational policies that affect all students attending American colleges and universities. In this respect, USNSA is the only student organization holding constituent membership on the American Council on Education and maintains liaison with the National Education Association, the American Association of University Professors, the National Association of Women Deans and Counsellors, the

National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare and a host of others.

"(7) Presenting the point of view and opinion of student leaders who have been democratically elected by their student bodies or student governments to attend the NSA National Student Congress, on public issues which directly affect American students with no regard whatsoever for their political affiliations or orientation. Any stand taken by the majority of these student leaders at a National Student Congress is designed to promote and stimulate student thought on issues of vital concern.

"(8) Contacting the millions of foreign students throughout the world who, in many cases, because of their ignorance of or lack of contact with American students, have as grossly distorted views of American students and American student life as we sometimes have about them. USNSA endeavors to promote mutual goodwill and understanding with students of other countries through exchange of ideas and information, exchange of students and faculty members, sending delegations to international student conferences, exchanging students with technical knowledge to aid students in emergent countries to put this knowledge to work in building stronger and more democratic educational systems, bringing foreign students that are leaders to this country for the purpose of observing the strength of American educational institutions and suggesting improvements of it. The entire USNSA international program is designed to promote mutual aid, understanding, friendship and goodwill with students the world over, and further, to clarify through contact and factual information the propaganda that has been spread by the communist-inspired and controlled organ known as the International Union of Students."

In 1961, the NSA staff boasted that "three of the nation's leading educational organizations [National Association of Women Deans and Counsellors, American College Personnel Association, and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators] have recognized the USNSA international program as a force which has 'spearheaded and led the mobilization of the unions of students of the free world in combatting the propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the communist International Union of Students. NSA more than any other group symbolizes the youth of the free world to the students of those critical areas where the battle of ideas has not yet been resolved.' " At the same time, the NSA staff had a complaint: "The charge has been made that USNSA membership has been dominated by NSA's leadership which is politically 'left.' We believe it has been demonstrated that, by the very nature of NSA's structure and the manner in which its leadership is elected (from among the members of the National Student Congress), the implications of this charge are virtually impossible and highly improbable."

In 1967, it was revealed that over a fifteen-year period the Central Intelligence Agency had subsidized the NSA with a total approximating three million dollars. About twenty foundations and organizations were used as financial conduits between the CIA and the NSA. (Wilson Carey McWilliams, who had been active in NSA, wrote in *Commonweal* magazine: "It might be pointed out that so radical a group as SDS [Students for a Democratic Society] was born as a result of, and incubated during, the National Congress of NSA, and SDS leaders like Paul Potter were national officers of the Association. There is a charm in the thought of CIA, however indirectly, financing SDS!")

By 1967, when the news of the CIA-NSA collaboration broke and created a sensational week or two in the nation's press, the NSA had woven a remarkably consistent pattern of far-left activities. The NSA had condemned the anti-Communist Cuban leader, Batista, and praised the Cuban Communist tyrant, Castro; had persistently called for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; had criticized the anti-Communist, anti-subversive McCarran-Walter Act; had protested against the firing of Communist teachers; had advocated membership in the United Nations for Red China; had propagandized against the anti-Communist regimes of Portugal and Spain; had defended anti-United States demonstrations by Japanese students; had extended hospitality at its 1962 Congress to the Communist Party, Communist Fronts (Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, and Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties), the Trotskyite Young Socialist Alliance, and the Young People's Socialist League; had allowed distribution of Communist and pro-Communist literature by the Students for a Democratic Society at its 1965 Congress; had opposed legislation which would ban the distribution of Communist propaganda through the United States mails at subsidized rates; had expressed regret for the lack of contact with the All-China Student Federation – the Chinese Communist student union; had condemned United States intervention in the attempted Communist takeover of the Dominican Republic; had recommended that the United States cease bombing and other offensive military action in Vietnam as a unilateral move toward a cease-fire; had recommended that the Viet Cong participate in negotiations to end the Vietnam War; had described the student riots at the Berkeley campus in California as responsible action; had rejoiced in the Communist takeover of Algeria; and had had on its adult advisory council such well-known anti-anti-Communists as Eleanor Roosevelt, Harold Stassen, Walter Reuther, Ralph Bunche, Erwin D. Canham, Reinhold Niebuhr, John Cogley, Ralph McGill, and George N. Shuster.

Aside from the CIA, the NSA has received financial support from the Ford, Field, New World, Rockefeller, and Danforth Foundations; the AFL-CIO; the Department of State; the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; the Schlitz Brewing Company; the Ballantine Brewing Company; the Office of Economic Opportunity; the Department of Labor; the National Institute of Mental Health; and the Stern Family Fund. A modest sum of money comes from membership dues and from the sale of publications. (In the fall of 1965, the NSA sponsored a four-day "National Conference on Student Stress." Thirty faculty members and sixty students, representative of thirty-three colleges and universities, took part in the conference and produced a report, "Students, Stress, and the College Experience." The entire undertaking was financed with grants from the National Institute of Mental Health and the Danforth Foundation. The study recommended: "That administrations do away with grading for the freshman year, or at least for a significant number of courses, to foster learning for its own sake rather than a struggle for 'symbols for success'; that students be more meaningfully involved in running their schools, especially in establishing tenure of teachers; that college credit be offered for 'field work' in hospitals, the Peace Corps, civil-rights activity, and the anti-poverty war; that independent study, in which a student pursues his own academic interests, 'should be increased in their number and scope' even to the point where a student, with proper guidance, designs his own courses." – Quoted in *The National Observer,* June 20, 1966.)

There are no individual memberships in the NSA. Membership is restricted to student governments. ("The student body of an institution of higher learning which has been recognized by the U.S. Office of Education or of any other institution of higher education whose minimum course is two academic years or more, and which teaches courses other than purely vocational, located within the territorial limits of the United States or its possessions, may affiliate with USNSA." – From Article II, A, of NSA's *Constitution.*)

The ultimate power of the NSA rests with its National Supervisory Board, composed of the national officers and ten voting representatives who are elected at the annual NSA Congress. The Supervisory Board has the power to set the time and location of the annual Congress, to elect all National Advisors, to supervise the execution of policies and programs determined by the National Student Congress, to approve all appointments made by the President to fill vacancies on the NSA's administrative staff, and to suspend or remove the national officers.

The National Student Congress meets each summer, generally on the campus of some large midwestern university. The Congress has two main functions: "It provides a meeting place for students from every area of the country to discuss mutual problems and ideas, and it is the official decision-making body for the policies and programs of USNSA." For its part, the NSA "claims only to be the most representative student group in the United States and to represent the views and opinions of a majority of American student leaders who have been democratically elected by their fellow students." The NSA describes its annual Congress as "the largest forum for the expression of the opinion and ideas of the American student community."

In a critique published in 1966 by Young Americans for Freedom (*NSA Report*), there was a cogent analysis of the National Student Congress: "One might begin to question the value of this 'forum' and the representative nature of the annual Congress, however, when it is realized that (1) less than fifteen per cent of the junior colleges, colleges, universities, and graduate schools which are eligible for membership in NSA actually belong to the Association; (2) less than fifty per cent of the member institutions generally send representatives to the National Student Congress; and (3) most of the delegates and alternates which 'represent' member schools at the annual Congresses are not democratically elected by the students whose views and aspirations they purport to represent. This, then, is the National Student Congress: a forum of student opinion representing the views of a few hundred young men and women who, in reality, can claim to represent no one but themselves, since most of them were not democratically elected by their fellow students. The few who are elected by their constituents usually will admit that they did not base their campaigns on the issues which are discussed at the National Student Congress."

There is abundant evidence that every annual National Student Congress has been a rigged affair, manipulated by a small group of entrenched leftists whose preparations for the Congress' agenda overwhelm the delegates from the nation's schools. Under the heading of "NSA's Internal Democracy," the Young Americans for Freedom in their *NSA Report* for 1963 observed: "The uninitiated student attending his first National Student Congress is confronted with a veritable bureaucracy of power. The Congress gives the appearance of being casually organized and loosely knit. But despite the casual dress (bermuda shorts, shirtsleeves, tennis shoes) the typical NSA Congress has been well thought-out in advance by people the delegates may never see. The most tangible evidence of this advance work is the voluminous sheaf of 'working papers' which are thrust at each delegate. It is obvious that the delegate will have neither the time nor the inclination to read the entire set – (over twelve volumes in 1962) – and so much the better for the NSA organizers. Through briefings by NSA staff members and officers, they are introduced to the concept of 'world student unity,' meet myriads of foreign dignitaries, attend receptions, get assigned to a subcommittee, receive a name plate, etc. Small wonder the wide-eyed delegate often gets the impression that he is being admitted to a secret and mystical organization predestined to save mankind from all evil in the world. But in most cases, the wonderment soon wears off."

In their 1966 *NSA Report,* Young Americans for Freedom said: "It is during the initial week of the Congress that delegates meet to discuss the issues upon which they must legislate during the final few days of the Congress. Armed with background papers which have been compiled by the NSA Staff, delegates begin their quest for truth by listening to the resource personnel which have been provided by the Association also. The background papers generally consist of a series of magazine reprints or excerpts from books. These materials reflect a liberal-left point-of-view and this mode of thought is usually complemented by the various speakers who appear. In 1965, for example, the background papers consisted primarily of reprints from magazines such as *The Student, The New Republic, The Commonweal,* and *Africa Report* as well as some contributions from the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Students for a Democratic Society."

After his attendance as a delegate to a National Student Congress, Bill Dalgetty of Iowa State University wrote: "After three days of congress participation it became quite evident that all discussion and legislation was deliberately directed to one point of view. Background and working papers from which delegates formulated their ideas and opinions represented only one side of the story. Resource personnel in many subcommittees and committees once again presented only one side of the question. On numerous occasions the chair spoke on one side of the issue without relinquishing his position as presiding officer.

"The night before subcommittees went into action the national officers held a meeting with a number of individuals. They wanted to know whether these individuals knew 'what they were to do, where they were to go, what resolutions they were to originate and what resolutions they were to defeat.'

"In many instances individuals from the back of the room would spring up and write a professionally worded resolution in a matter of minutes. Obviously it had been thought out and written beforehand . . . . "

James J. Archey of Stonehill College summarized his experiences as a delegate to a National Student Congress: " . . . The principal case against USNSA is that the association does not represent the students on political issues – first, because the delegates to USNSA are not, in most cases, elected by the student body but are chosen by their student governments, and second, because, even when they are elected by the student body, it is not on political issues. USNSA is under control of ultra-liberal students and professionals who ram through programs pleasing to them, setting up the committee chairman and working papers and, in some cases, by flagrant abuses of parliamentary rights.

"Before USNSA can truly represent the students, its delegates must be elected on their campuses on political issues."

The leftward bias of those who manipulated the parliamentary proceedings of the various annual Congresses was enhanced by the barrage of propaganda directed against the delegates by the ultra-leftist organizations invited to participate, including the Communist Party, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the Young People's Socialist League, the Black Panthers, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee, the Students for a Democratic Society, and the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Individuals from the ultra-left who have participated as guest speakers or delegates to the Congresses have included: Daniel Rubin of the Communist Party; Phillip Luce, at the time an official of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; Burton White, leader of riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities; Marvin Markman, an official of two Communist youth groups; Susan Markman, an official of a pro-Communist youth group; David Harris (husband of Joan Baez), who was imprisoned on a conviction for draft evasion; racial agitator Dick Gregory; leftwing pacifists Michael Ferber and Benjamin Spock; Tom Hayden, founder of Students for a Democratic Society; Robert Scheer, one of California's most active and notorious radicals; Rev. Joseph Duffey of Connecticut, a top official of Americans for Democratic Action; Ramsey Clark, the ultra-leftist Attorney General from Lyndon Johnson's Administration; Richard Goodwin, the ultra-leftist speech writer from the Kennedy dynasty; Charles Garry, the chief counsel for the Black Panthers; Rennie Davis, one of the most vocal American supporters of the Viet Cong; John Kenneth Galbraith, a confirmed Socialist, masquerading as a Democrat; supporters of the Viet Cong; and various representatives of black militant groups.

The scandalous revelations of 1967 when the NSA was exposed as a dependent of the CIA caused some institutions to withdraw their membership. Nevertheless, the NSA survived and its annual Congresses and other activities became, if anything, more flagrantly leftist.

In October 1967, *Life* magazine reported that the NSA had plans "to bring any university which won't cooperate with our desires to a grinding halt," and that NSA had selected more than forty campuses for revolutionary action, including Columbia University, the University of Colorado, and Stanford University. (The NSA, in addition to its endorsement of revolutionary action on campuses, went all-out at its 1967 Congress to support black militancy: "Black power is the unification of all black peoples in America for their liberation by any means necessary.")

In November 1967, at the University of Minnesota, the NSA held its First National Student Power Conference. NSA's President Edward Schwartz presented a working paper to the conferees. One of the few journalists to report on the event was syndicated columnist Edith Kermit Roosevelt. She analyzed four steps which Schwartz presented as necessary if campuses were to be controlled by student radicals:

"(1) *Gradual Escalation.* According to the NSA paper, this means that 'students must be weaned gradually into revolutionary fervor.' The NSA president warns, 'If the base of support for initial goals is too broad, as fundamental objectives become explicit, campus participation may dwindle. Once that happens, it's all over.'

"(2) *Non-Negotiable Tactics.* NSA instructs student revolutionaries that 'the goal is to create a dialectical situation in which the administration is forced to reject seemingly reasonable requests for change in such a manner as to alienate the entire campus.' The reason given for avoiding negotiations, such as would take place if reform rather than revolution was the goal of these students, is that 'as soon as the first proposal appears negotiable, followers will be lost.' What this adds up to is that the radicals want college administrators to become immoderate or reactionary and to alienate the entire student body. A typical 'dialectic situation' was the emergence in Germany of the contending totalitarian Nazi and Communist parties with no role being allowed for such moderate groups as conservatives and liberals. This is what every revolutionary group seeks to bring about.

"(3) *Administration Fury.* NSA stresses the importance of maneuvering the president of the college or the regents into reacting angrily and slurring the character of the campus groups. The NSA president declares, 'Even if your first proposal is not acceptable to many students, the administration's reactions will outweigh their reservations. A slur on the character of any student group within reasonable bounds of respectability is an indirect slap at the entire campus. That should be made clear.'

"(4) *Campus Response.* Student workshops are advised by NSA, 'If the first move appears too inflammatory, the students may feel that the administration's response is justified. If you can get a few campus "respectables" or even invulnerables like honors students and Woodrow Wilson winners, you will have a better chance of success.'

"The NSA Paper admits frankly that the goal of revolutionary campus movements are basic changes within the universities, such as 'resignation of the president, abolition of the board of trustees, elimination of classes.' "

In April 1968, "the National Student Association approved formation of a nonpartisan lobbying body to support five major legislative items a year approved by its annual congress. Students are expected to bring direct pressure for such favorite topics as the 18-year-old vote, liberalization of drug laws, draft opposition, educational reform and civil rights." (*New York Times,* April 23, 1968.)

Harvey H. Hukari Jr. reported on the 1968 NSA Congress, held at Kansas State Univeristy (*Human Events,* September 14, 1968): "Customarily, this year's gathering was treated to an array of attacks by speakers on the evils of racism, the Selective Service System and the Establishment as well as the penultimate spectacle of an anti-war dissident burning his draft card. But after all the heated resolutions were proposed and the impassioned pleas were made by a galaxy of left-wing spokesmen, the summary tone of the convention differed only slightly from NSA's established tradition of oral radicalism and physical lethargy . . . .

"By comparison with last year's tumultuous convention, this year's Kansas gathering was a rather pallid affair, enlivened only by the antics of a 'guerrilla theatre' and various sophomoric protests against the draft . . . .

"Many delegates were . . . disturbed by the predominantly radical orientation of many of the programs and speeches. One of the featured speakers was Negro militant and self-proclaimed presidential candidate Dick Gregory. Addressing an overflow audience, Gregory labeled Chicago Mayor Richard Daley a 'slick, slimy, racist hoodlum' and later received a standing ovation when he declared that people have a duty to destroy and abolish the present government. 'We don't need white liberals anymore,' said Gregory. 'We need white radicals.'

"Typical of the 'balanced' presentation of views which NSA afforded delegates was a panel entitled 'Theories, Strategies and Directions for Change.' Participants in the discussion were Rev. Joseph Duffey, the Connecticut chairman of the McCarthy for President committee, Tom Hayden, founder of SDS and presently co-director of the National Coalition to End the War in Viet Nam, and Robert Scheer, an editor of *Ramparts* and a well-known California radical.

"The 'dialogue' consisted of Rev. Duffey urging young people to stay in the political system and Hayden and Scheer calling for increased militancy on the part of students. Hayden, who was later arrested during the demonstration in Chicago, predicted that there would be more campus disorders like the one at Columbia and was applauded by the delegates. He went on to proclaim that 'No presidential candidate will be safe speaking at any university in this country.'

"The Selective Service System was the subject of a panel presentation by Michael Ferber, convicted in Boston along with Dr. Benjamin Spock for counseling young men to avoid the draft, and David Harris, husband of folk singer Joan Baez, who is presently appealing a three-year prison sentence for draft evasion . . . .

"As if it were not enough for the speeches and panel presentations at the convention to be mostly radical in their orientation, the entertainment provided the delegates also had a distinctly left-wing flavor to it. Among the films that were shown were Felix Greene's 'Inside Viet Nam,' which gives a sympathetic view of North Viet Nam under communism, 'The War Game,' a British picture that attempts to illustrate the horrors of a nuclear missile attack on England, and 'Point of Order,' which deals with the Army-McCarthy hearings."

Robert Powell, who was elected to NSA's presidency at the 1968 Congress, delivered an inflammatory acceptance speech: "We've asked to be heard, and they've refused to listen to us. We've asked for justice, and they've accused us of anarchy. It's time to start showing this country what student power can do. Don't tell us how to run our lives. We're running our own lives now. We're going to turn this damned country around."

On October 17, 1968, the *New York Times* reported: "The National Student Association announced today a call to colleges and universities to suspend classes on October 29 in a 'Time Out Day' for students to seek an answer to the question, 'Where do we go from here?'

" 'It is not a strike,' said Robert S. Powell Jr., president of the group . . . .

"Mr. Powell said that his association was suggesting that students carry on their activities on the day, a Tuesday, even if college officials refused to shut down operations. He said some conflicts were expected but that 'it is too early to tell' whether the day might bring widespread demonstrations or disorders on campuses . . . .

"Mr. Powell said at a news conference that 'the critical need for such a day springs from our bitter experience over the past 12 months even though students have won some significant victories on campuses and in the political system of the nation.'

"Activities will range from peaceful discussion to direct action and confrontation with college officials."

On December 2, 1968, the *New York Times* reported: "Edward Schwartz, . . . [former president and currently an official] of the National Student Association, outlined a program today in which all students reclassified 1-A could appeal Selective Service decisions and thus disrupt its operations.

"Mr. Schwartz said at a news conference that reclassified students were urged to seek personal interviews with the draft boards and to appeal the reclassification 'to the limit' through the Selective Service System.

"The program's aim, he said, is to make known student views of the draft and of the Vietnam war."

In August 1969, the National Student Congress was held in El Paso at the University of Texas campus. The officials and delegates to the Congress could not help but be flabbergasted when they received a telegram from President Richard Nixon: "My warmest greetings go out to the participants of the National Student Association. I am most heartened by the new social consciousness that swells the ranks of America's youth organizations. Your human concern and civil awareness bode well for the future of our nation. Your fresh insights and determined desire to probe deeply into the heart of current national interests, pursued within the framework of our democratic society, are evidence of your important role in helping to build a life of greater opportunity, dignity and justice for all our citizens. I welcome your ideas and advice and those of all young Americans, as together we seek to obtain this common goal."

Mr. Nixon's friendly overtures suffered a severe rebuff during the course of the El Paso Congress. The delegates voted to grant $50,000 in reparations to a group of black militants, who nevertheless stormed out of the Congress when the National Student Association refused to brand itself as one of the nation's foremost "racist institutions." The delegates voted to support a Vietnam Moratorium demonstration to close the nation's scholastic institutions in November as a visible protest against United States participation in the Vietnam War. A resolution to condemn violence and disruptive demonstrations on campuses was rejected. And NSA's vice president for executive affairs, William Shamblin, was received with enthusiastic favor as he urged the NSA's members to "consider disruption seriously" as a means of solving campus problems. Said Shamblin: "After all, [disruption] worked so well at CCNY, Columbia, etc., and disruption will and should be continued this coming year . . . . Take over buildings, destroy classified files and information . . . . What we're trying to correct in this insane unbalanced society is this insane unbalanced condition . . . . The SDS chapters deserve our admiration and support. They have attacked locally relevant problems. NSA must do the same if it is to deserve continued existence."

The 1970 National Student Congress was held at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota. The delegates voted to support legislation that would legalize the sale and use of marijuana; to censure President Nixon; to condemn FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and to urge his immediate removal from office; and to recommend that policemen be forbidden to attend college, no matter the individual's or college administration's views on the matter.

Ronald F. Docksai reported on the 1970 Congress (*Human Events*, September 19, 1970): "At the recent convention, a resolution condemning the Viet Nam war and advocating a general plan to seize Washington, D.C., by force on May 1 was narrowly defeated. After a night of vociferous debate, however, and after the staff realized that any effort to camouflage NSA's rampant politicalism would be futile, an almost equally harsh resolution was passed on August 16 by a vote of 214 to 50. (The accuracy of this rollcall is highly doubtful, by the way, since including the many observers in the hall, there were, by actual head count, only 270 persons on the floor.) Part of the resolution reads as follows: *Mandate:* (1) NSA shall aid in the promotion of anti-war, anti-racism, and anti-poverty activities through local and regional organizing and educational programs.

"(2) That NSA work in October to help organize National Peace Petition Week (October 3-10) in order to raise $10 million and 20 million signatures so we can take our case to the American people via the mass media and generate local organizations that will provide the base for other actions.

"(3) NSA shall (by aiding Rennie Davis' National Teach-In Week) communicate the nature of and the urgency for ending repression at home and the war in Indochina.

"(4) NSA shall support the August 29 Chicago Moratorium . . . .

"(5) If the war has not ended by May 1, 1971, NSA will commit itself to a concerted expansion of massive, non-violent action, including civil disobedience, at the local, regional and national levels."

Mr. Docksai noted other features of the proceedings: "With the exceptions of Richard Goodwin and Ramsey Clark, both of whom received polite applause from the bored audience, the speakers at this year's NSA Congress were in step with the organization's affinity for radical elements on the political left.

"Rennie Davis, for example, won a standing ovation after he called for a victory for the National Liberation Front in Viet Nam and urged that the delegates join him in 'beating down' Nixon. Tom Hayden, also a member of the 'Chicago 7' and a founder of SDS, proposed a nationwide political party called 'The Organized Revolutionary Party,' which would be based on collectives. This won acceptance by many of the delegates, but the majority, although not necessarily less radical, seemed more intellectually in tune with the aurora borealis.

"Another speaker, Black Panther attorney Charles Garry, brought the delegates 'greetings from Huey Newton . . . and Bobby Seale.' He informed the not-so-innocent audience that 'fascism is on the way' and implied the need for street fighting in a speech which ended with the confession, 'Whether it be out in the street or in the courtroom . . . I don't differentiate between the two struggles.' "

In December 1970, NSA's President David Ifshin led a group of fifteen NSA members on a trip to North Vietnam. The delegation's announced purpose for the visit to the enemy's country was to carry out a mandate issued at the NSA congress in August when the NSA officers were instructed "to engage in negotiations for a peace treaty between the students of the North and South Vietnam and the students of the United States." From Moscow on December 20, Ifshin announced that he carried joint declarations signed by the Student Union of North Vietnam, the Student Union of the Viet Cong, and the National Student Union of South Vietnam. The documents called for the immediate and total withdrawal of all United States forces from Vietnam and the withdrawal of United States support from the Saigon regime, headed by President Nguyen van Thieu. Ifshin said that he and his fellow travelers viewed the documents as "an affirmation of friendship and solidarity, expressing our mutual desire for peace and opposition to the aggressive policies of the Nixon-Agnew Administration." He also threatened "a major shutdown of Washington" by "nonviolent civil disobedience" acts on May 1, 1971 – coincidentally, a traditional and annual date for Red demonstrations.

RIPON SOCIETY

REPUBLICANS FOR PROGRESS
REPUBLICAN ADVANCE
ADVANCE

In 1950, when Senator Robert A. Taft and Representative Joseph W. Martin were recognizable as conservative leaders of the Republicans in Congress, there was a Young Turk revolt against them. The revolutionaries, known as Republican Advance, included Representatives Kenneth Keating and Jacob Javits of New York, Clifford Case of New Jersey, John Davis Lodge of Connecticut, John Heselton of Massachusetts, Clifford Hope of Kansas, Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, and Richard Nixon of California. (Javits, Nixon, Scott, Keating, and Lodge were elected to Congress in 1947; Case and Heselton in 1945; and Hope in 1927.) They were financed by Henry Luce of *Time-Life* and Sidney Weinberg, a political manipulator from New York City.

The three main purposes of Republican Advance were to organize a liberal Republican opposition to the Taft-Martin conservatism, to work for the election of a liberal Republican Congress, and to downgrade Communism and Communists as political issues. (Francis Biddle, who had been Attorney General in Franklin Roosevelt's Administration and, in 1950, was chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, expressed the hope that Republican Advance and the ADA would become formally affiliated, since "both are working towards the same end." In 1954, Democratic Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada described Republican Advance as appearing "to stand in approximately the same relation to the Republican Party as Americans for Democratic Action stands to the Democratic Party.")

Republican Advance never did surface in the style of the ADA. Throughout whatever history it had, it remained highly secretive and its demise was never formally recorded. However, of its original adherents, Keating, Javits, Case, Scott, and Nixon became members of the Senate, and Lodge became Governor of Connecticut.

In February 1961, a group of Harvard University students published the first issue of a magazine – *Advance.* (The choice of a title for the publication was more than coincidental.) On its masthead, it was stated: "*Advance* has no official connection with the Republican party, or with any party, although Republican politics are a major concern of the magazine." The staff of the magazine presented the purpose of *Advance*: "America continues in need of a new political philosophy – one that borrows freely from the best of both 'conservatism' and 'liberalism,' and whose essence is not mere moderation.

"Those of us who have nurtured *Advance* into publication believe that such a new philosophy – not yet fully articulated – will most likely evolve within the Republican Party, and that it is from the progressive Republicans that it will emanate.

"We hope that our readers will find a satisfactory discussion of the political approach of progressive Republicanism within the covers of *Advance*, for that is our purpose in publishing.

"We hope too that our readers will take an interest in what *Advance* has to say, whether or not they agree with it. We assure the more sympathetic readers that they may feel free to contribute their own thoughts to the magazine. And we'll certainly cherish – though undoubtedly with mixed sentiments! – the opinions of critics.

"What we won't take too well is bland apathy, especially from Republicans, all of whom have a stake in the intellectual development of the party. Faced with the contingencies of a changing political horizon, the GOP will likely adopt a restatement of traditional Republicanism between now and 1964. The nature of this restatement concerns us all.

"For its part, *Advance* will be looking to the modern Republicans for the development of that restatement, and for the development of what may be a new political philosophy and method."

The editorial in the first issue of *Advance* had the title (again more than coincidental), "Toward a Republican Advance." It was a belabored attempt to clarify such terms as "liberal," "progressive," and "conservative," and their relationship to the Republican Party. The writers of the editorial made an effort to present themselves as somewhat tolerant of conservative inclinations by some Republicans some of the time, but not tolerant of Conservative Republicans. *Advance's* staff preferred the liberal-progressive (or modern) Republican such as Senators George Aiken, Clifford Case, John Sherman Cooper, Kenneth Keating, Leverett Saltonstall, and Margaret Chase Smith, Representative John Lindsay, former Vice President Richard Nixon, and Governor Nelson Rockefeller – all of whom were in the leftist ranks of the Republican Party.

Advance was far more than a student magazine. It was a propaganda vehicle to carry the liberal-progressive-modern Republican gospel according to Nelson Rockefeller. Financial support was given to the magazine by David Rockefeller, John L. Loeb Jr., and Harold Stassen. (In 1964, Loeb was a founder of National Independents for Johnson and Humphrey and contributed $3000 to the Democratic Party.) The publisher of *Advance* was Bruce K. Chapman, who, in 1960, was Chairman of Students for Nelson Rockefeller. The editor was George F. Gilder, who later became an associate editor of *New Leader*, the most literate Socialist publication in America. Robert Beal was listed as business manager, Michael Laurance as managing editor, Edward S. Cabot as contributing editor, Thomas E. Petri as staff editor, and Christopher Beal, Wesley Williams, and David McClintock as associate editors.

The publishing history of *Advance* was most unusual. It began on a schedule of five-times-yearly; after two issues on a six-times-yearly basis; the next three issues on a five-times-yearly basis; then dropped to a four-times-yearly basis. All in all, *Advance* was published about a dozen times from February 1961 until the spring of 1964. Its newstand price went from 25 cents to 35 cents to 50 cents. Its masthead changed in every issue: along the way John Saloma became associate editor; Ira A. Lipman, associate publisher; Joel Fisher, associate publisher, advertising manager, and contributing editor; Emil Frankel, Alan Henrikson, and Camden Hall, contributing editors; Edward Hall, Thomas Motley, Janet Mendell, and James Ormand, assistant editors; George Hobart, reporter-at-large; and Carolyn Reaves, Sally Green, and Alice Kepler, editorial assistants. Bruce K. Chapman and George Gilder, however, remained throughout *Advance's* history as publisher and editor, respectively. But when Chapman completed his studies at Harvard, the offices of *Advance* moved from Cambridge, Massachusetts, to Washington, D.C.

At no time did *Advance* have many more than eight or ten thousand subscribers, but its complimentary list was considerably larger. In the spring of 1963, however, its financial difficulties were of such a nature that a fund-raising dinner was held for *Advance's* benefit. Chairman of the dinner was John A. Roosevelt. Others on the dinner committee were John L. Loeb Jr.; Gabriel Hauge, former economic adviser to President Dwight Eisenhower; Kenneth Keating; Theodore Kupferman, Republican Councilman of New York City; Jean McKee, a former official of the New York Young Republicans and a Nelson Rockefeller campaigner; Martin McKneally, political advisor to Nelson Rockefeller; Charles McWhorter, former chairman of the Young Republican National Federation and former legislative assistant to Vice President Richard Nixon; Grant Reynolds, head of the National Negro Republican Assembly; and John A. Wells, a campaign manager for Jacob Javits and Nelson Rockefeller.

The ultra-liberal gathering at the $100-a-plate dinner was regaled with speeches by John Lindsay and Republican Representative Fred Schwengel of Iowa. Among those in the audience were Arthur

Goldsmith, a perennial power behind political thrones; Hamilton Fish, once the soul of conservatism in the House of Representatives; and Frederick Sontag, a public relations man who had been a consultant to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell in the Eisenhower Administration. Despite the impressive list of supporters, *Advance* published only one issue after the fund-raising dinner.

In its brief history, *Advance* garnered an enormous amount of publicity. Its biggest boost, however, came in 1962. George F. Hobart recounted the incident in *National Review* (September 25, 1962): "The 'All-Republican Conference' at Gettysburg June 30th undoubtedly produced one thing – a prize political blunder on General Eisenhower's part. It was at this 'unity' session that the General gave his unwitting endorsement to *Advance*, a slick mouthpiece of modern Republicanism.

"There under the blue and white tent Ike praised the little-known publication ('I have read at least one of its copies containing a piece "Advice and Dissent." . . . I would commend it to each of you . . . . '), calling attention specifically to its March issue which had thoroughly blasted the Republican leadership in Congress. And there under the same blue and white tent sat Senator Everett Dirksen and Representative Charles Halleck whom *Advance* had pelted as 'comic relief . . . intellectual paupers . . . humorous . . . fat and choleric . . . . leaders [who] are not leading.' "

The endorsement by Eisenhower was seized upon by *Advance's* publisher Bruce Chapman, and in the July 1962 issue, under the heading "Ike Likes Us," he quoted the former President as saying of *Advance*: "The magazine is the kind of thing we need to sponsor and think about . . . one of the most thoughtful magazines . . . I have ever seen."

By the time the former President – not noted for his profound reading habits – had given his unqualified endorsement to *Advance*, the magazine had established itself as a totally biased outlet for leftwing Republicans. Its heroes were Jacob Javits, Kenneth Keating, John Lindsay, and Nelson Rockefeller of New York; Silvio Conte, George Lodge, Henry Cabot Lodge, Bradford Morse, Elliot Richardson, and Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts; Thomas Kuchel of California; William Ayres, Ray Bliss, and Robert A. Taft Jr. of Ohio; Thomas Curtis of Missouri; Clifford Case and James P. Mitchell of New Jersey; Charles Mathias of Maryland; and such prominent Eastern Establishment figures as Arthur Burns, Gabriel Hauge, and Arthur Larson.

Among those who contributed articles to *Advance* were Clifford Case, John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky (advocating "Federal Aid to Education"), Thomas Curtis, Morton Halperin (advising a disarmament agreement with the Soviet Union in "Limited War and Arms Control"), Jacob Javits, Henry A. Kissinger, Arthur Larson, John Lindsay, George Lodge (in praise of the Communist-controlled International Labor Organization in "ILO: Spearhead for Democracy"), Richard Nixon, Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney, and Hugh Scott. Edward S. Cabot contributed a maudlin piece in praise of Ghana's Communist leader Kwame Nkrumah. George F. Gilder urged an extravagant federal program for civil defense, especially concerned with the subsidizing of community fallout shelters by the federal government.

One of the most unusual items to appear in *Advance* was a letter-to-the-editor from Richard Nixon: "The magazine is impressive in every way – in format and style and, most important, in its overall quality . . . . I could not agree more that our first order of Party business must be to maintain as a continuous image and responsible voice, that 'vibrant center' or creative middleground that is the area of true Republicanism. Every four years we re-affirm our tradition; but unless and until we make this a job for every day of every year, we will probably deserve a permanent minority status in dynamic American society.

"I have long held the opinion that it is important for those who would take an active interest in political philosophy and issues to avoid slogans and clichés as a substitute for open minded analysis. In other words, I think it is more important for an individual to know why he holds the views he does than to find a doctrinaire label which is descriptive of his general political philosophy and use this to predetermine his position on every problem.

"These are, of course, views that I believe I very largely share with you and that I am trying to articulate in my own round of activities. Thus I suspect we will often be fighting the same fights, on substantially common ground. And this is a long-range prospect that I, for one, find very encouraging indeed."

In articles and editorials, *Advance* chose as its villainous Republicans all those whose principles, in whole or in part, were anti-statism, anti-internationalism, and anti-Communism. Particular targets included Bruce Alger, Leslie Arends, John Ashbrook, Styles Bridges, Clarence Brown, John Byrnes, Everett Dirksen, Barry Goldwater, Durward Hall, Charles Halleck, Edgar Hiestand, Clare Hoffman, Chester Merrow, John Rousselot, and Robert Wilson. Southerners in Congress, whether Democrats or Republicans, were almost without exception anathema to *Advance*.

Despite *Advance's* impressive list of supporters, its big-name writers, and its disproportionate amount of publicity, its readers received notice in the spring of 1964 that liberal Republicans would henceforth be without an "intellectual organ of communication." *Advance* was ceasing publication. In a four-page letter, the editors despaired of the liberal Republicans who had neither a Barry Goldwater nor a Hubert Humphrey to lead them, nor an organization to promote the "progressive Republican philosophy." Reading between the lines, the *Advance* editors seemed disappointedly resigned to the fact that Goldwater was almost certain to capture the Republican presidential nomination. The editors lamented: "As a long-range political movement, progressive Republicanism is in terrible shape. Its saving force at the moment, as in the past, is its strategic logic in the presidential campaign: only a progressive can win national office. But while it is possible every four years to force-feed to a parochial party organization the views of its rank and file voters and the bipartisan facts of life, the last-minute effort is risky and unfailingly wasteful of energy, talent, time and money. A quadrennial presidential strategy simply cannot sustain the progressive Republican movement."

To those who wished to promote "progressive Republicanism" as a "long-range political movement," the editors of *Advance* had a bit of advice: for such persons, "there is the Ripon Society, a group of young intellectuals in Cambridge, Massachusetts, volunteering research for the party." The advice was narcissistic. The lineage between *Advance* and Ripon was direct.

A friendly observer, Stewart D. Davis, writing in the *Harvard Law School Bulletin,* recounted the origins of Ripon: "The roots of the now much-publicized but fledgling Ripon Society (of whose 50 members about half are Harvard Law students) extend across the Atlantic to Great Britain and deep into the minds of Emil H. Frankel, and John S. (Jack) Saloma, Assistant Professor of Political Science at M.I.T. [Saloma was an associate editor and Frankel a contributing editor of *Advance.*] Both Frankel, who spent the 1961-62 school year in England, and Saloma, who was there in 1959-60, were impressed by the experience of the Bow Group, made up of young Conservatives, university graduates mainly, which was formed in 1951 to give that party an image of excitement and intellectualism.

"These Tories wanted their party to be a vehicle for the expression of ideas, a place for the application of mind to public problems, in order to counteract both the Labour Party's appeal and the feeling in Britain that the Tories were the 'stupid' party. This Bow Group has already produced a significant number of leaders, and may constitute as much as two-thirds of the next Tory cabinet.

"During the fall of 1962, Saloma and Frankel together decided that the Republican Party had a need greater by far than the Conservatives to be known as a party with ideas and a place for dynamic thinking. Inspired by their British counterparts, they adopted the name of the Wisconsin town where the Republican Party was reportedly founded in 1854 and set out to restore the Party's Lincolnian tradition of constructive idealism."

The first Ripon meeting took place on December 12, 1962 at the Harvard Faculty Club in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Along with Saloma and Frankel, early members included *Advance* staff members Thomas E. Petri, Christopher W. Beal, and Edward S. Cabot.

Ripon's activities began slowly, and during its first year of existence the membership was content to meet once a month to hear speeches by *Advance* heroes such as Governor John Chafee of Rhode Island, Representative Thomas B. Curtis of Missouri, and Henry A. Kissinger of Harvard University.

Stewart D. Davis described Ripon's emergence as an activist organization as having taken place in December 1963: "The event which ignited the Society and thrust it forward on the national stage was the assassination of President Kennedy. At the conclusion of the one-month moratorium which followed the President's death, the Society's open letter, 'A Call to Excellence in Leadership,' was released, which argued 'the center is once again contestable. We believe that the Republican Party should accept the challenge to fight for the middle ground in American politics.'

"The ringing call was for young, thinking 'fiery moderates' to put on the mantle which had necessarily fallen from the dead President's shoulders and make the GOP the party to strive 'with a passion to get on with the tasks at hand.' The Riponers said to each other that with Kennedy's death the Democrats would lose the aura of his youthful imagination under the leadership of New Deal-schooled and oriented

Lyndon Johnson and would become the ' "stand-pat" conservative party of today.' Believing that potential moderate GOP leadership did exist, and that moderates in that Party had too long been silent, Ripon's desire was to create an atmosphere where bright young moderates could establish themselves in the Party."

The first major action undertaken by Riponers was an anti-Barry Goldwater campaign during the primary races and convention activities of 1964. Also in 1964, Ripon inaugurated a series of position papers. In January, it published *The Open Letter: A Call to Excellence in Leadership,* in which, with ideas and language that had become familiar to readers of *Advance,* the Riponers were warring against conservatism and for a liberal-progressive-modern takeover of the Republican Party. In April, *Republicans and Civil Rights: A Continuing Commitment* was released. This paper, written by Riponers, was issued as a report of the Critical Issues Council of the Republican Citizens Committee, headed by Milton Eisenhower. The Republican Citizens Committee was born at the All-Republican Conference at Gettysburg – the same conference at which Dwight Eisenhower had issued his strong endorsement for *Advance*; in 1963 and 1964, Joel Fisher, who had worked for *Advance,* was the RCC's organization director. The RCC was merely an attempt to exert liberal-progressive-modern influence on the Republican Party, and its "report" on Civil Rights advocated total commitment to the Civil Rights legislation being promoted by the most extreme liberal elements in the Congress. In July 1964 *A Declaration of Conscience* appeared. It bore a remarkable similarity to the various editorials that had appeared in *Advance*, calling for a liberal-progressive-modern reformation of the Republican Party by ousting its old-guard, conservative leadership. *The Republican Governors' Association: The Case for a Third Force* followed in December 1964. This Association had been formed in 1963 at the instigation of the Riponers and their supporters. The Riponers drafted the Association's "constitution" and guided the entire proceedings of its 1964 meeting. Ripon's position paper advocated that the Governors' group become almost completely independent of the Republican National Committee and its "Goldwaterism," so as to be a vital third force in the rebuilding of the Republican Party.

The last of this series of position papers, *Election '64*, came out in January 1965. It was a venomous attack upon Barry Goldwater and called for a complete reform of the Republican National Committee, a purge of Goldwater Republicans from the Committee's staff, a liberal-progressive-modern takeover of Republican leadership in the Congress, and the establishment of research facilities for The Wednesday Club – the liberal-progressive-modern Republicans in Congress. Leftwinger Theodore H. White, author of *The Making of the President, 1964,* told the Riponers that their *Election '64* "was far and away the best study of the elections made by anyone; I leaned heavily on it in my final chapter – and described it as the best such study in a footnote to my own analysis so that readers who want the whole story can refer to your report. It was absolutely first class; I am in debt to all of you: and will you pass my thanks on to all concerned?"

The Riponers returned to the topic of the 1964 defeat of Goldwater in their *From Disaster to Distinction: Rebirth of the Republican Party,* published in 1966, with a foreword written by Senator Hugh Scott. Lavish praise was given the study by Senators Jacob Javits and Thomas Kuchel, Governors Daniel Evans of Washington, John Chafee of Rhode Island, and George Romney of Michigan.

In *From Disaster to Distinction,* the Riponers stated: "Republicans must leave behind the meaningless arguments of conservatism versus liberalism, public versus private, business versus labor, hard line versus soft line and come to terms with the truly new challenges." For a change the Riponers adopted the term "moderate" to describe the type of Republican they desired in power: "The moderate chooses the center, the middle road, not because it is halfway between left and right. He is more than a nonextremist. He takes this course since it offers him the greatest possibility for constructive achievement." The moderate rejects simple solutions and "cries out that such solutions do not exist. The moderate holds the greatest danger for the extremist because he holds the truth and there is no absolute 'truth' that can make the complexities of man and his society simple. It is time to put away the tired old notion that to be 'real Republicans' we must be as different as possible from our opponents. If we let the Democrats pre-empt good positions on every issue while we simply react, then we are doomed to continuing futility."

The Riponers indicated clearly that the Johnson Administration, saturated as it was with Americans for Democratic Action, was worthy of emulation: "What is the Republican future in the 'Great Society'? There is no future in calling for wholesale repeal of major items of 'Great Society' legislation. Certainly there is room for responsible criticism of the administrative failures. But progressive Republicans must themselves join in the search for sensible and efficient answers. The American people sense that the 'War on Poverty,' crime, disease, illness and illiteracy is moving in the right direction."

In an all-out message for statism-paternalism, the Riponers said: " . . . we can make no more important statement than this: For Republicans, the real opportunities lie beyond the issue of the 'welfare state.' The technological revolution will afford Republicans new opportunities for humane and efficient reform in government bureaucracy and the public services . . . . "

The American Conservative Union in its *The Ripon Society Report* observed: "Not only has Ripon been able to perform the research and development function for the party's minority wing, but it has also been effective at getting news coverage for its ideas, wide acceptance by the press as a *bona fide* 'Republican study group,' and an entrée into the councils of the party leadership."

M. Stanton Evans, writing in *Human Events* (October 29, 1966), said: "The group [Ripon Society] is a shoe-string enterprise . . . boasts little by way of permanent staff and has no appreciable leverage within the national Republican party . . . . Despite its peculiar views and humdrum credentials, the Ripon Society has become relatively famous. It needs only to crank up its mimeograph machines to have its thoughts carried by the mass media into every corner of America . . . . The Ripon Society is in the same category as a staged campaign photograph, a televised mockup of 'presidential decision-making,' or a 'demonstration' fabricated for the TV cameras. Ripon's ideas get publicized because they are invented to be publicized. Were it not for the fact that the Liberal media find in them a convenient pretext for disparaging conservatism, they would not be decocted in the first place. Ripon pronouncements are covered in the *New York Times* while the views of an official Republican group like the GOP Congressional Committee are ignored, for the simple reason that Ripon suits the media conception of what the Republican party ought to be, and the Congressional Committee does not."

What the American Conservative Union and Evans noted about Ripon's ability to reap publicity has been especially true in the *New York Times, Los Angeles Times, Washington Post, Christian Science Monitor, Baltimore Sun, Houston Chronicle, Boston Globe, Boston Herald-Traveler, New York Herald-Tribune* (now defunct), *St. Louis*

Post-Dispatch, Milwaukee Journal, New York Post, Louisville Times, and *Philadelphia Inquirer.* Such liberal pundits as David Brinkley, Roscoe Drummond, Julius Duscha, John Herbers, Chet Huntley, Mary McGrory, Thomas O'Neill, Chalmers Roberts, Tom Wicker, David K. Willis, and Lyle Wilson could be relied upon to treat a Ripon Society hand-out as an Olympian political pronunciamento.

For example: In 1966, the Ripon Society issued a policy statement on Red China. The United States government was urged to relax its rigid attitude toward Red China by giving some consideration to Red China's qualification for membership in the United Nations. U.S. government officials were urged to use the Red Chinese name Peking, rather than Peiping, as used by the Nationalist Chinese. A two-China policy was proposed for consideration as an American diplomatic posture. Cultural, scientific, and tourist contacts between Americans and Red Chinese were encouraged. The U.S. was advised to adopt a more flexible trade policy toward Red China, and to sponsor Red China's participation in international parleys on disarmament and control of nuclear weapons.

Ripon's Red China policy was essentially a call for U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China, repudiation of Nationalist China, and inauguration of complete and peaceable intercourse with Mao Tse-tung's regime. In substance, there were no differences between Ripon's advocacies and those which had been offered by the Red China lobbyists since 1950. Yet the liberal press media greeted Ripon's warmed-over proposals as something highly newsworthy and startlingly original. Headlines in the nation's press indicated how seriously the tiny Ripon group was regarded by the liberals: "GOP Unit Asks More Flexible China Policy" (*Los Angeles Times*); "GOP Group Urges Softer China Policy" (*Tampa Tribune*); "GOP Group Calls For Easing China Policy" (*Louisville Times*); "GOP Group Urges U.S. To Adopt Flexible Policy On Red China" (*St. Louis Post-Dispatch*); "GOP Group Urges An 'Olive Branch' Offer To Peking" (*Chicago Sun-Times*); "Republicans Urged To Fill 'Leadership Vacuum,' Press For More Flexible China Policy" (*Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*); "GOP Intellectuals Urge Change In U.S. China Policy" (*Philadelphia Inquirer*). The *New York Post* hailed the Ripon policy statement in an editorial ("Solving The Chinese Puzzle"). The *Philadelphia Bulletin,* in an editorial, described the Riponers as "GOP's Mental Masseur," and thought the policy statement valuable. The *New York Times* not only greeted the policy statement as a "breath of fresh air" but printed a full-column "special" dispatch by its Washington correspondent, Tom Wicker, who did nothing but paraphrase the Riponers' press release. Wicker's column, which was little more than an unpaid advertisement for the Ripon Society, was headlined: "G.O.P. Told To Fill Vacuum On China."

Although the Riponers have always been numbered only in the hundreds, and their membership has been confined for the most part to the campuses of Harvard University, Columbia University, the University of California, Yale University, and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, they have been able to boast that their small group has worked directly on preparing policy declarations, research papers, and background memoranda for Edward Brooke, Thomas Curtis, Dwight and Milton Eisenhower, Daniel Evans of Washington, Christian Herter, Kenneth Keating, Henry Cabot Lodge, Charles Mathias, Bradford Morse, Richard Nixon, John Reed of Maine, George Romney, Leverett Saltonstall, Hugh Scott, William Scranton, and Stanley Tupper of Maine. Riponers have worked on campaign committees or administrative staffs of Edward Brooke, Thomas Curtis, Robert Finch, Robert Griffin, Jacob Javits, John Lindsay, Henry O'Bryant, Charles Percy, John Reed, and George Romney. The Riponers have also been extremely partial toward Clifford Case, John Chafee, Silvio Conte, Charles Goodell, Thomas Kuchel, Elliot Richardson, Nelson Rockefeller, Francis Sargent, and John Volpe. (Republicans for Progress, an adult version of the Ripon Society under the chairmanship of Charles P. Taft, has solicited campaign funds for Edward Brooke, Clifford Case, Robert Griffin, Mark Hatfield, and Charles Percy.)

The roster of Ripon's heroes bears a remarkable similarity to that of the now-defunct *Advance.* The same holds true of its villains. Ripon has always been extremely hostile toward Barry Goldwater and his adherents; Ronald Reagan; Spiro Agnew; Melvin Laird; John Mitchell; ex-Democrats Strom Thurmond and Albert Watson; Gerald Ford; Ray Bliss; John Rhodes; Young Republicans; Southern Republicans in general; and Vietnam "hawks."

The recipients of Ripon's blessings have responded in kind and by their testimonials have enhanced the splinter group with grossly disproportionate prestige: "I am delighted that the Ripon Society is doing its best to concentrate some attention on those concepts that are truly the foundation of our Party" (Dwight Eisenhower). "The Ripon

Society is a welcome source of new light both morally and intellectually for the Republican Party" (William Scranton). "The Ripon Society has an important role to play in a Republican Party that is a creative, dynamic political force" (George Romney). "Your contribution to Republican thought has been immeasurable" (Milton Eisenhower).

For its own part, the Ripon Society describes itself as "a Republican research and policy organization composed of young members of the business, professional, and academic communities. The Society seeks to rally the energies and talents of thinking young people to the cause of constructive Republicanism. It strives to generate creative discussion which will produce a bold and persuasive Republican policy posture." As late as 1970, Ripon's President J. Lee Auspitz described the group as a "bridge between politics and the academic community."

The obvious attempt by Riponers to portray themselves in the image of youthful ivory-tower intellectuals aloof from practical politics has been abetted by parrots of the press who dwell on phrases that deliberately avoid an honest admission that the Riponers are leftwing reformers bent on making the Republican Party indistinguishable from the ultra-left of the Democratic Party. The unimaginative liberals of the press repeatedly stress that the Riponers are "youthful," "intelligent," "moderate," and "liberal," and are engaged in "research" and "advice." The Society is "an organization of moderate and liberal Republicans drawn largely from the academic world" (Eileen Shanahan, *New York Times*); "Republican intellectuals" (*Philadelphia Bulletin*); "GOP intellectuals" (*Philadelphia Inquirer*); "a liberal group of academically oriented Republicans" – "a Republican research and policy organization" – "a group of liberal and moderate Republicans from the universities, business and the professions" (*New York Times*); "university Republicans" (Thomas O'Neill); "liberal Republican research" group (*Los Angeles Times*); "a private Republican research group" (Associated Press); "a Republican research and policy group" – "a liberal youthful Republican organization" – "to generate thought and debate within the party leading to the adoption of creative policies" (United Press International); "a group of young, moderate Republicans" (John Herfort in the *Boston Globe*); "liberal Republican organization" (Richard Stewart in the *Boston Globe*); "progressive" – "youthful and liberal" – "a talent bank and an idea factory" for Richard Nixon (Mary McGrory); "a brain shop" (Deckle McLean in the *Boston Globe*).

There have been a few contrasting views of the Riponers. Syndicated columnist Alice Widener has called the group "the Republican counterpart of Americans for Democratic Action." Editor William F. Buckley Jr. has called it "an organization of Liberal Eastern seaboard intellectuals which will not rest until the Republican Party becomes an exact duplicate of the Democratic Party, give or take a shadow here or there." Representative John Ashbrook of Ohio, however, made one of the most perceptive observations when he told his congressional colleagues in 1966: "The Ripon Society, as many of my Republican colleagues know too well, is for the most part composed of a handful of college students who are being egged on *by their liberal leaders* [emphasis added] to help shape a liberal Republican takeover of the GOP. They have been notably unsuccessful in trying to sell their nonphilosophy of 'Amorphous Moderation' to any *bona fide* Republican organization. Their pronouncements, unfortunately, are given all the dignity of a major GOP policy statement in our Nation's most established newspapers. Thanks to plenty of money and the services of a talented public relations professional [Frederick Sontag], the disorganized ramblings of their position papers and newsletters have been seriously reported in nationally syndicated columns and on the front pages of big metropolitan dailies."

When Mr. Ashbrook expressed these sentiments in the Congress, he was calling attention to the notices which the Ripon Society's book, *From Disaster to Distinction: The Rebirth of the Republican Party,* received in the *New York Times* and *Baltimore Sun.* In the *Times* of October 10, 1966, John Herbers reviewed the book in fifteen column-inches of type, under a headline reading, "GOP Moderates Call For 'Rebirth' Of The Party." In the *Sun* of October 9, 1966, Thomas O'Neill devoted a lengthy column to the same book. Mr. Ashbrook noted that on September 23, 1966, the American Conservative Union sent press releases and copies of its *The Ripon Society Report* to Washington correspondents, editorial writers, and columnists, including Messrs. Herbers and O'Neill. On the basis of the ACU's mailings, two nationally syndicated columnists (David Broder and William F. Buckley Jr.) wrote columns on September 27 and 28, respectively. Yet when Herbers and O'Neill devoted so much space to the Riponers' book less than two weeks later, they made no mention of the fact that an important and current critique of the Ripon Society was in circulation. Mr. Ashbrook asked: "Would it not be fair to expect 'the greatest publication that ever was' [the *New York Times*] to present other views on the future of the Republican Party, views opposed to the destructive criticism of the Ripon Society?" He then remarked: "In all fairness, I think any large daily newspaper has an obligation to do so . . . . Of course, this is not the first time members of our party have noticed this lopsided view in the press. Ever since 1962, when the Ripon Society came into existence, news coverage of their activities has far outstripped their reputations within the GOP."

Mr. Ashbrook's protests were soon proved to be in vain. On October 30, 1966, the *New York Times* carried a front-page story by John Herbers. Under the headline, "GOP Groups See Chance To Rebuild Party In South," Herbers wrote that "two national Republican organizations said today the nomination of 'demagogic candidates' in Southern Democratic primaries had provided the Republicans with an opportunity to build a strong, nonracist party in the South." The "two national Republican organizations" mentioned by Herbers were the two tiny splinter groups: the Ripon Society and its adult offshoot, Republicans for Progress. Herbers built his lengthy story about a "joint statement" issued by the Riponers and Republicans for Progress. In truth, the "joint statement" was merely a press release accompanying the announcement and circulation of another Ripon policy paper – *Southern Republicanism and the New South,* written by John C. Topping Jr., John R. Lazarek, and William H. Linder of the Ripon Society. For some reason, Herbers thought it important enough to mention that the Ripon-written report was endorsed by the Ripon Society and the related Republicans for Progress. Unmentioned by Herbers was the fact that "research" for the report was financed by Elmer Anderson and Fowler McCormick, both of whom were adult leaders of the Riponers. Nor did Herbers mention that the authors of the report acknowledged the assistance they had received from Ripon's president, John Saloma, and Frederick Sontag, the genius behind the phenomenal Ripon Society-Republicans for Progress publicity. Herbers did, however, faithfully paraphrase the highlights of the Riponers' diatribe, in which conservative Southern Republicans were branded indiscriminately as "extremists" and "racists."

Throughout its history, the Ripon Society has made the South a particular target of its scorn but, at the same time, the Riponers were extremely anxious that the Republican Party cultivate Negro voters wherever they were. In January 1965, the Riponers advised the

Republican Party to concentrate its support on civil rights legislation: "Only by championing the cause of civil rights can [the party] make real and permanent gains in the South and retain strength in the North." The Republicans, according to the Riponers, should disavow what they alleged had been Goldwater's strategy in 1964: cultivate conservative Southerners and oppose civil rights. For success, the Riponers advised that the Republicans conduct Negro voter registration drives, establish friendly relations with the Negro press, appoint a Negro as associate chairman of the Republican National Committee, apply pressure to state Republican groups to "assure that all state party machinery and elections are administered on a completely open and nondiscriminatory basis," and support the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and insist upon "its effective enforcement and the passage of such civil rights legislation as may prove necessary in the future." (M. Stanton Evans analyzed the Riponers' preoccupation with racial issues and concluded: "The society's self-appointed mission is to prove that the Republican party is not, should not be, and cannot be conservative; that the *beau ideal* of Republican sagacity is John Lindsay; and that the GOP must in all respects make itself as Liberal, or if possible more Liberal, than the Democrats. It argues that Barry Goldwater's 1964 defeat proved conservatives cannot win national elections, and that the GOP must hereafter do anything and everything to capture the ethnic voting blocs of the big cities. All of this is offered as pious counsel for the salvation of the Republican party. A somewhat different motive, however, now and then comes looming through the rhetorical fustian. On the one hand Ripon says Republicans must forget about limited government and private property in order to chase down votes with ever more punitive 'civil rights' bills, simply as a matter of hard-headed politics. Never mind, Ripon says, about outmoded principles; we have got to win elections. Yet the group recoils in horror at any suggestion that the GOP can in fact win elections by hanging onto its principles rather than abandoning them. Thus the fact that conservative Southern Republicans have been elected in increasing numbers in recent years is viewed by Ripon as nothing short of repulsive. Riponers have equal contempt for the conservative congressmen of the West and Midwest, the Republican leadership of the House, and such Republicans as Ronald Reagan. It becomes apparent that, while Ripon claims to be frightened of conservative Republicans who lose, its real fear is of conservative Republicans who win. Its interest is not to save the GOP by injecting it with Liberalism; it is to save Liberalism by injecting it with the GOP.")

The Riponers called on Reagan to "reaffirm the relationship of confidence between statehouse and campus." They regretted that a "hostile atmosphere has resulted in part from the way in which university policy has been treated as a political issue." Then, in what could only be considered as a flight of imagination, they said: "The Ripon Society has worked to build bridges between the Republican party and the campuses of America and Republicans have looked more and more to the campuses for advice and talent to aid them in building a creative majority party. It would be most regrettable if this mutual respect which has marked an important Republican advance on the intellectual front were interrupted or reversed by the recent events in California . . . . An attitude of mistrust and mutual antagonism can never build a creative society."

Aside from the approval Reagan received when he acted against Kerr, the Riponers were especially alarmed that Reagan's popularity in California might result in his obtaining the Republican presidential nomination in 1968. And the Ripon Society could not, under any circumstances, countenance Reagan, especially in light of his "hawkish" stand on Vietnam.

In September 1967, the Riponers issued their own policy statement on Vietnam (*The Realities of Vietnam* by Josiah Lee Auspitz and Christopher Beal, in the Ripon *Forum*). The Riponers, in their advice to the Republican Party, began with the usual liberal premises: the struggle in Vietnam was essentially a political and civil war; they had no respect for South Vietnam's government or army; they were opposed to bombing of North Vietnam; they raised the specter of Red China's entrance into the war if provocative U.S. bombing were extended.

For a solution to the Vietnam War, the Riponers offered a "confederal strategy." In the first phase of the strategy, provincial and district elections would be held in non-Viet Cong areas and those elected would assume control of taxes, police, militia, land reform, schools, and American aid programs. In the second phase, the same sort of elections and results would be accomplished "where the Viet Cong and non-Communist leadership coexist." (The Riponers based this assumption about coexistence on their premise "that a large proportion of Viet Cong cadres are not indoctrinated in Communist ideology. What is more, local [Viet Cong] cadres, who see the scale of American commitment, are much more likely than their leaders to become convinced of the permanency of the American presence in South Vietnam, to admit the hopelessness of taking the cities, and to be willing to make deals with the Americans.")

In December 1967, Auspitz and Beal, the authors of the Ripon Society's "confederal" policy on Vietnam, issued an eleven-page statement which was duly publicized by the *New York Times.* The headline over the "special dispatch" read: "GOP Unit Warns of Possible Thrust Into North Vietnam." The essence of the news-that-was-fit-to-print was that Auspitz and Beal, who admitted that they had no inside information, suspected that the Johnson Administration was planning an invasion of North Vietnam. Their fears were based on "a number of publicly recorded events," which "when set in the context of past plans and discussions" could "point in the direction of a wider war." The two Riponers cited a speculative "invasion plan," which they said was "leaked" to the *Washington Star* and the *New York Times* on May 27. They also cited General William C. Westmoreland's statement of November 29, when he said that Hanoi had not committed some battle divisions to South Vietnam because it "has to secure its own shores."

The attention given by the *New York Times* to the Auspitz-Beal suspicions, which were based on the flimsiest sort of evidence, dramatized the fact that "a small university-based group of Republican liberals" (the *Times'* phraseology) was accorded the status of a major voice of the Republican Party simply because it had issued a statement that was in accord with the *Times'* overall policy of supporting Liberals no matter what their party affiliation.

The election year of 1968 was a very active one for the Riponers. They demonstrated at Resurrection City in support of racial agitator Ralph Abernathy's Poor People's Campaign. They endorsed the congressional candidacy of Allard Lowenstein, vice president of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. They urged that the United States respond to the Soviet invasion of Czecho-Slovakia by extending diplomatic recognition to Red China. However, the Riponers' biggest concern in 1968 was the Nixon campaign for the Republican presidential nomination. (In 1967, the Ripon *Forum* complained that Nixon was beginning to look "more and more like a junior Goldwater.")

The disappointment felt by the Riponers over Nixon's successful bid for the nomination was best expressed in a letter unearthed by *Human*

Events. The letter, dated August 12, 1968, was written by Riponer Richard A. Zimmer to Riponer Lee W. Huebner. (At the time the letter was published by *Human Events* [December 20, 1969], Zimmer was president of Ripon's New York chapter and a member of Ripon's national board. Huebner, a former president of Ripon, was a speechwriter for Nixon.) Said Zimmer to Heubner, a week after the Republican National Convention: "Now that I've had time to get the smell of decomposing pachyderm out of my nostrils, I've been able to come up with a few ideas regarding where we (the Ripon Society) should go from here.

"First, I am convinced that any political influence we might be able to exert must be exercised within the Republican party. Although a number of us (myself included) will refuse to vote for a man who has mortgaged the White House to Strom Thurmond, we would gain nothing from a public bolt *à la* Jackie Robinson . . . .

"This does not mean that we need support Dick and Spiro. On the contrary, I believe that even quiet acquiescence to the thrust of the campaign, as it is now conceived, will hasten the doom of the moderate wing of the GOP, the defeat of the party in the coming election, and the dissolution of the Ripon Society. With the prospect so grim we have less to lose from being incautious.

"I propose that we immediately issue a public ultimatum to Nixon requiring him publicly to disavow any veto his Southern supporters might have over future appointments, to affirm the GOP's commitment to the vigorous enforcement of civil rights legislation and to rule out any major escalation of the Vietnamese war. We should word such an ultimatum graciously enough for Mr. Nixon to accept, remembering that he would probably welcome an opportunity to refurbish his centrist image.

"For the longer run, we must stop taking comfort in the marginal improvements we have been able to make in the party and realize that they have thus far merely cosmetized an essentially reactionary group of politicians . . . . To change the party in any substantive way, we must create an organization equipped to take power. Unlike Ripon, this organization must be composed largely of politicians. We can't be such an organization, but we now have the knowledge and contacts to bring such a group together.

"The week that Nixon is defeated, a national organization of professional politicians should announce that it is going to strive to nominate John Lindsay in 1972 by taking over the party from the precinct level up . . . .

"If we can't (or won't) set up such a candidate-oriented organization, the very least we should do is set up a permanent intelligence and communication operation to carry out full-time the kind of in-depth, delegate-oriented research traditionally begun each election year . . . . What we need is someone like John Price working full time with adequate staff.

"I still believe in the value of the Ripon Society; there is no material respect in which I would change it. But I have come to the realization at the convention that the members and friends of Ripon had better start taking chances and getting their hands dirty because no one else will do it for us.

"Promoting Ripon and saving the GOP are not the same thing; if we devote ourselves to Ripon and stay above precinct politics as we have done, we will soon become impotent and irrelevant. Leaders like Nixon will react to our criticism the way Stalin did when he was warned of possible censure by the Pope: 'How many divisions does the Pope have?' "

The Ripon Society, no matter its professed Republicanism, took no consolation from Nixon's victory. Less than a month after the election, the United Press International (November 30, 1968) carried a dispatch, datelined Washington: "A Liberal Republican organization charged today that President-elect Richard M. Nixon had lost a chance to win broad voter support in the election because he decided to 'ride the backlash tide' to victory. 'The Republicans won the election, but they lost the campaign,' the Ripon Society said in a statement. 'Nixon's pursuit of the Wallace vote alienated the liberal "frontlash" voters, almost lost him the Presidency and spoiled Republican chances of making substantial gains in the House of Representatives . . . . Far from marking the end of the New Deal Democratic coalition, as had been anticipated, the election strengthened it outside the South and polarized voting patterns against the Republicans.' The society . . . said that Mr. Nixon had hurt his own campaign and that of other Republicans by 'lukewarm support of racial integration . . . a Wallacite theory of crime causation' and a statement saying the Senate should postpone approval of the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The society urged Mr. Nixon to appoint liberals to his Cabinet."

With Nixon in the White House, the Riponers directed most of their advice toward him. They had been forced to make a reluctant endorsement of his candidacy but their hearts belonged to John Lindsay and others on the far left of the Republican Party. During Nixon's first year in office, the Riponers opposed him during the anti-ballistic missile controversy. They objected to any Nixon overtures made to conciliate the South and they urged him to create a cabinet-level department of human rights. They opposed his Vietnam policy every step of the way. (In November 1969, Michael Brewer, the political director of the Ripon Society, collaborated with the New Mobilization group and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee in their anti-Vietnam War binge in Washington, D.C., when they called for an immediate, unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam.)

The Riponers' real *bête noire* in Nixon's Administration was Attorney General John Mitchell, who was considered by the group to be the political advisor closest to Nixon and most responsible for Nixon's conciliatory attitude toward the South. The Riponers called upon Mitchell to resign if he continued to allow political considerations to affect his responsibilities in law enforcement, especially in the civil rights area. Mitchell responded to his Ripon critics by branding them as "little juvenile delinquents." He defended the Justice Department as the government's legal arm: "We're lawyers with clients, we're not policy makers."

At the very time the Riponers were warring against the Attorney General, they were also celebrating their seventh anniversary with a dinner in Washington. The office-holders sponsoring the dinner included Republicans who could be relied upon to oppose the Nixon Administration wherever it was out of line with Ripon policy: John Sherman Cooper of Kentucky, Charles Mathias of Maryland, William Saxbe of Ohio, Peter Frelinghuysen of New Jersey, Paul McCloskey of California, and, of course, John Lindsay of New York. John Anderson of Illinois, the chairman of the left-of-center House Republican Conference, was the principal speaker at the dinner.

In February 1970, the Ripon Society inaugurated a rating system for U.S. Senators. By Ripon standards, if a Senator supported Nixon on all twenty-nine selected votes, he would receive a rating of thirty-four per cent (Ripon opposed the President on a sixty-four per cent basis). Charles Goodell and John Sherman Cooper were closest to Ripon's standards with only one vote short of perfection. (Philip Hart of

Michigan, a Democrat, achieved an eighty-two per cent rating. The lowest ranked Democrats were John McClellan of Arkansas and Herman Talmadge of Georgia.)

In March 1970, at Airlie House in Virginia, the Riponers held a meeting to discuss the topic: *Needed: A Republican for the 1980's – A Call for Modern Republican Leadership*. Sponsors of the meeting were Margaret Heckler of Massachusetts, Paul McCloskey of California, Tom Railsback of Illinois, and Don Riegle and Phil Ruppe of Michigan. In attendance were David Hawk, the Vietnik; Marge Sklencar, national coordinator of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee; White House aides Richard Blumenthal, Robert J. Brown, and Harry Fleming; Assistant Attorney General William Ruckelshaus; and Richard Velde, as associate administrator in the Justice Department. The gathering heard Riponers and their soul-mates launch attacks upon Richard Nixon; Spiro Agnew; John Mitchell; Harold Carswell; Southerners in general; and the Republican National Committee.

In July 1970, the Riponers issued an 84-page report, *The GOP and the South,* by Michael Lottman. The President was advised to plan his strategy for the 1972 presidential campaign. He should not try to "out-segregate" the Democrats. He should seek a new alignment within the Republican Party – moderates [Riponers], blacks, young workers, and businessmen. As the Riponers issued their advice, they could sense some assurances that it would be heeded: by the summer of 1970, at least nine members of the Ripon Society were members of Mr. Nixon's White House staff. At the same time, reliable estimates placed Ripon's total membership at less than two thousand.

W.E.B. DuBOIS CLUBS

PROGRESSIVE YOUTH ORGANIZING COMMITTEE
ADVANCE
YOUNG WORKERS LIBERATION LEAGUE
YOUNG COMMUNIST LIBERATION LEAGUE

In April 1959, a number of Communist Party leaders decided that there was need for a new Communist Party youth organization. At their December 1959 national convention, the Communist Party leaders established the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee as a national youth organization and Advance as a New York City youth club.

In January 1963, the Attorney General of the United States took action against Advance, and at his behest the Subversive Activities

Control Board designated Advance as a Communist front. Consequently, Advance and the Progressive Youth Organizing Committee went out of business.

In October 1963, the head of the Communist Party, Gus Hall, ordered "the formation of a Marxist-oriented youth organization to attract non-Communists as the first step toward their eventual recruitment into the party."

Meanwhile, in 1961, in San Francisco a small group of revolutionaries, committed to "Marxism, peace, civil rights and civil liberties," organized themselves as the W.E.B. DuBois Club. (The group was named after the aged Communist war horse who had received the Lenin "Peace" Prize in 1960.) In 1962, off-campus chapters of the DuBois Clubs were formed at the University of California (Berkeley) and at San Francisco State College. In 1963, an off-campus chapter was formed at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Following Gus Hall's order to establish a new youth organization, the Communist Party leaders decided to make the small semi-clandestine DuBois Clubs a national vehicle. At the Communist Party annual convention, it was decided that a national organizing convention for the DuBois Clubs would be held in June 1964. (FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover explained: "In memorializing the late Dr. DuBois, the new organization apparently hopes to win recognition and support from both domestic and international civil rights proponents, African nationalists, and more particularly the Negro youth of the United States. Following the trend of recent years of playing down the Communist label, the new Marxist youth organization is designed to attract youth interested in peace, disarmament, civil rights, and the like.")

When several hundred delegates arrived in San Francisco for a three-day organizing convention in June 1964, they were greeted by the Communists' customary Aesopian language and told that the convention had been called by "a group of young people who felt that Socialist alternatives must be explored if this country is to solve pressing political, social and economic problems."

The delegates were presented a registration statement that was exemplary of the soft-sell Communist line: "(1) This nation can best solve its problems in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence, disarmament and freedom for all peoples throughout the world. (2) These solutions will be reached mainly through the united efforts of all democratic elements in our country and particularly through the unity of Negro and white Americans and all other minority groups. (3) It is the working people of our country through their organizations, whatever their present difficulties, who will ultimately be the decisive force in meeting our pressing social and economic needs. (4) The greatest danger to American democracy comes from the racist and right-wing forces acting in alliance with the most reactionary sections of the economic power structure. (5) The most effective tool used in the fight against social progress has been the divisive weapon of anti-communism. This weapon must not be used to split young people as it has in the past."

The convention received greetings from Joan Baez, Carl and Anne Braden, Paul Robeson, and Bertrand Russell. Speeches were made in support of Martin L. King Jr., the Vietcong, disarmament, "free" universities, and Cesar Chavez' grape strike. The Communists took no chances that the convention would get out of hand. Financing of the three-day affair was taken care of by the Communist Party and Terence and Matthew Hallinan, sons of the wealthy old-time Communist, Vincent Hallinan. National, regional, and local Communist leaders were on hand to keep the convention under the firm control of the Communist Party.

In attendance were Communists Bettina Aptheker, Carl Bloice, Archie Brown, Alva Buxenbaum, Terence and Matthew Hallinan, Mickey Lima (Communist Party chairman of northern California), Marvin Markham, William M. Mandel, Roscoe Proctor (a national committeeman of the Communist Party), Al Richmond (editor of *People's World*), Holland Roberts, Arlene Shupak (business manager of the Communist publication, *New Horizons for Youth*), Douglas Wachter, and Mike Zagarell. Sons and daughters of Communist Party members included David Bacon, Diane Beeson, Ken Cloke, Eugene Dennis Jr. (his father was once chairman of the Communist Party, USA), Michael Eisenscher, Roseanne Forrest, Phyllis Mandel Glick, Elizabeth and Louis Goldblatt, Margaret Lima, Oleta and Billy Proctor, and Paul Richards.

Emerging from the convention, the DuBois Clubs had Phil Davis as president; he had been a field secretary for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and in 1962, had attended a Communist Party recruiting school. (Davis was succeeded in the presidency by Hugh Sterling Fowler II, a founder of the 1965 Congress of

Unrepresented People and their riotous march in Washington, D.C.) Of the Hallinan brothers, Terence became the organizing secretary, Matthew the educational director, and Patrick the counsel for the DuBois Clubs. Michael Myerson became international secretary (in 1962, he had headed an American delegation at the Communist Youth Festival in Helsinki, and in 1965, had gone to North Vietnam on a propaganda mission). Eugene Dennis Jr. was designated editor of the organization's bulletin. (In the spring of 1965, the DuBois Clubs began publication of *Insurgent* magazine. Carl Bloice of the *People's World* headed the editorial staff, which included David Castro, Michael Folsom, Celia Rosebury, and Karol Supriano. *Insurgent* had a very irregular publishing schedule and after a few issues went out of existence.)

Once the Communists had organized the DuBois Clubs, little time was wasted in organizing chapters on and off campuses throughout the country. From the beginning, the DuBois Clubs worked directly with the Socialist Workers Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, Students for a Democratic Society, the Young Socialist Alliance, the Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Young People's Socialist League, and the Congress of Unrepresented People. They agitated on a variety of issues: racial equality, poverty, "police brutality," and especially the war in Vietnam. And, as is customary among the leftists, individuals in the DuBois Clubs also held membership in one or more of the allied groups.

Within a few months after the DuBois Clubs were formed, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, faced with incontrovertible evidence, described the DuBois Clubs as a "Communist-spawned organization." In rebuttal, the executive board of Berkeley's DuBois Club said: "The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America . . . is an independent socialist youth organization, with neither a 'line' nor any policy of secrecy or exclusion. Anyone can join the club with no questions asked. There are large differences of opinion among us and the areas of agreement can be described only in generalities. Principally, we believe that the changes which must be made in the social structure in the interests of simple humanity, such as an end to racial discrimination, jobs for all who want them, and decent food, housing, education and cultural activities for every individual, can only be fully accomplished when respect for human dignity and a concern for the general welfare have replaced the profit motive as the guiding principles of human endeavor. We have a broad name for this new social structure, and that is 'socialism.' But rather than wait for the advent of this better society, DuBois Club members join people fighting for improvements in their daily existence.

" . . . The clubs will not exclude anyone who considers some form of socialism a viable alternative for the United States. The DuBois Clubs, each branch as well as the national organization, are democratically run and leadership is nominated and elected in normal parliamentary fashion.

"The reason Hoover and others are attempting to red-bait the DuBois Clubs is that they fear we have the potential of convincing significant numbers of young Americans that a socialist society could solve the vexing social problems which our consciences demand we solve."

Despite repeated denials by DuBois Club leaders of Communist tie-ins, the assistant director of the FBI, William C. Sullivan, said in June 1965 that the DuBois Clubs was "a Communist front organization designed to exploit and attract college students." A month later, Gus Hall of the Communist Party boasted: "We're winning. Fronts are a thing of the past. We don't need them. We've got the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs . . . going for us, but they're not 'fronts' in the usual sense of the word." (It was more than a year before Hall completed his thought. On August 28, 1966, while in Moscow, Hall said that the Communist Party was playing a leading role in American leftwing student organizations, particularly the DuBois Clubs.)

In 1964 and 1965, simultaneously with its organizing efforts, the DuBois organization played a major role in the riots at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, in the riotous "civil rights" demonstrations in San Francisco, and in the massive and riotous anti-Vietnam War demonstrations in Washington, D.C.

In June 1965, many members of the DuBois Clubs attended a Communist Party training school where the lecturers included such Party dignitaries as Gus Hall, Hy Lumer, Claude Lightfoot, Henry Winston, James Jackson, Herbert Aptheker, Betty Garnett, Marvin Markham, and Alva Buxenbaum. The strategy behind the school was explained by J. Edgar Hoover when he testified before a House Subcommittee on Appropriations in February 1966: "Party leader Gus Hall, well aware of the fact that the future of the party depends on youth, has called for an all-out effort to recruit additional youths into the party. One of the steps taken in response to this edict was the creation of a summer youth project to train additional cadre for leadership positions. This project was inaugurated with a two-week national youth leadership school under maximum security conditions at Camp Midvale, N.J., in June 1965. Leading party officials were extremely pleased with this school which was attended by some 80 students from various parts of the United States. These students received instructions in Marxism-Leninism from top party officials. The students then spent the remainder of the summer working full time for the party in various party districts under the regular party leadership.

"A primary task of the students who attended this school was the recruitment of minority youth for the party's year-old front group, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America. During the summer of 1965, this organization launched an ambitious program aimed at bolstering its Midwest region, which had been beset by factional disputes, lack of organization, and adverse publicity. Participants in this program spoke of this 'summer project' in glowing terms at a conference of national coordinators of the DuBois Clubs held over the Labor Day weekend in Chicago." (In 1965, at its annual convention, the DuBois organization elected Communist Party member Franklin Alexander as national chairman. Alexander, from the Watts section of Los Angeles, was hopeful that the DuBois Clubs would gain control of the "black power" movement.)

Finally and quite belatedly, in March 1966, Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach petitioned the Subversive Activities Control Board to order the DuBois Clubs to register as a Communist front. By a remarkable coincidence, the San Francisco headquarters of the DuBois Clubs were destroyed by an explosion on the day following Katzenbach's action. There were no injuries and, even more remarkable, no files of the organization were found in the remains of the building.

The Worker reacted to Katzenbach's move by accusing him of "Red-baiting." The American Civil Liberties Union charged that the U.S. government was "suppressing political dissent." Rushing to the support of the DuBois Clubs vis-à-vis Katzenbach and the Subversive Activities Control Board were the Reverend James Bevel, a close associate of Martin Luther King Jr. in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Julian Bond, the radical Georgia legislator; David Dellinger, the Communist editor of *Liberation* magazine; Clark Kissinger, a national leader of Students for a Democratic Society; John Lewis, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee;

Abraham J. Muste, one of the all-time leaders of radicalism in America; Elizabeth Sutherland, New York director of SNCC; and Dagmar Wilson, founder and leader of Women Strike for Peace. Staughton Lynd of Yale University's history department was so angry at the government's action against the DuBois Clubs that he became a member of the organization.

Other well-known supporters of the DuBois Clubs included Donna Allen of Women Strike for Peace; the Reverend William Sloane Coffin, the radical chaplain of Yale University; Ralph DiGia of David Dellinger's *Liberation* magazine; Mrs. Cyrus Eaton, the pro-Communist wife of the pro-Communist Cleveland industrialist; Frank Emspak of Students for a Democratic Society; Carl Oglesby, a leader of SDS; Norman Thomas, the Socialist Party leader; and Jack Weinberg of the Congress of Racial Equality.

Shortly after the Department of Justice initiated action against the DuBois Clubs, the organization moved its headquarters from San Francisco to Chicago, where it held its 1966 convention. Speakers at the convention included Communist leader Donna Allen of Women Strike for Peace; Herbert Aptheker; Attorney William Kunstler; and Hunter Pitts O'Dell, a Communist and an associate of Martin L. King Jr. Hugh Fowler II was elected national chairman. (Communist leader Gus Hall said at the time: "DuBois Clubs have become the most influential youth organizations in the United States. Quite naturally we have the closest ties with the DuBois Clubs since they occupy a Marxist position.")

The DuBois organization was not intimidated by the federal government. Its members were prominent in the 1966 Cleveland riots. Members were also active in anti-draft demonstrations and various campus rebellions.

In 1967, the DuBois Clubs sought a test case against the Subversive Activities Control Board, but the United States Court of Appeals ruled against the effort and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the ruling. In 1968, the DuBois Clubs tried unsuccessfully in the U.S. District Court in Washington, D.C., to obtain an injunction against the government's efforts to have the organization register as a Communist front.

Meanwhile, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover issued periodic warnings to the Congress on the nature of the DuBois Clubs. In February 1967, Mr. Hoover testified: "The W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America sponsored a national youth conference at Washington, D.C., on August 27-28, 1966, for 'jobs, peace, and freedom.' DuBois Clubs leaders had announced that 1000 to 1500 participants were expected and that other organizations, including the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; the International Warehousemen's and Longshoremen's Union, which was expelled from the Congress of Industrial Organizations in 1950 as a Communist-dominated union; and the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, were co-sponsors of the conference.

"On August 27, 1966, workshops and speeches were held at the Sylvan Theater. The 100 individuals participating in this activity included such prominent Communist Party members as Michael Zagarell, national youth director of the party; George Meyers, chairman of the Maryland, District of Columbia, and Virginia District of the party; Bettina Aptheker, a member of the party's National Committee; and Franklin Alexander, national chairman of the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America and a member of the Communist Party. The workshops were led by members of the Communist Party and the DuBois Clubs.

"On August 28, approximately 125 individuals attended a mass meeting at the Sylvan Theater to hear speeches and the results of the workshops. One DuBois Club member was arrested by the United States Secret Service for having made remarks of a threatening nature against the President during a workshop on August 27, 1966. Upon conclusion of the meeting the group, which had increased to nearly 190 individuals, marched to the White House where they picketed for a short period. The group carried placards protesting police brutality, poverty, and the war in Vietnam."

In February 1968, Mr. Hoover testified: "Since it was organized in June 1964, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America has been the Communist Party's main spokesman to the youth of our Nation. This Communist front continues to receive practically all of its financial support from the Communist Party. Many of the organization's members have 'gone up' to membership in the party; however, they still work closely with the DuBois Clubs to carry out programs and activities which are initiated by the party.

"The DuBois Clubs, because it is made up of young Communists, has been utilized by the Communist Party to work with the new left movement, particularly on the campus, and influence it toward its line of thinking. This organization, hand in hand with the primary spokesman of the new left, the Students for a Democratic Society, has encouraged youth to resist the draft and subject the Selective Service System to harassment and agitation."

In the summer of 1968, many members of the DuBois Clubs attended a Communist Party indoctrination school at Camp Webatuck. They were lectured on Marxism-Leninism, the Negro question, and labor issues by Communist leaders, including James Jackson, Hy Lumer, George Meyers, Danny Rubin, Henry Winston, and Helen Winters.

Adverse publicity and competition from other far-left groups wreaked a toll upon the DuBois Clubs, and in April 1969, J. Edgar Hoover testified: "The position the party should take in regard to the activities of the New Left is . . . a matter of much discussion, but in recognition of the New Left's role in attracting dissident youth, the party will relinquish some of its activity on college campuses to the New Left in order to concentrate on industry. In March 1969, the Communist Party-U.S.A. held a West Coast Youth Conference to revamp its youth organization, the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America. Since the membership of the DuBois Clubs has now declined to less than 100, it was deemed necessary to change the concept of the organization from a massive-type organization to a young Communist organization, but it would still remain under the DuBois label. The loss of student members to the more active organizations of the New Left was indicated by the fact that working-class youth represented about 75 percent of those in attendance at the conference while students represented only 25 percent. In former years the ratio had been reversed."

In February 1970, the leadership of the Communist Party decided to dissolve the DuBois organization and replace it with a new group. At a convention run by Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party, there was founded the Young Workers Liberation League, also called the Young Communist Liberation League. (State groups could use either name.) Jarvis Tyner, the last national chairman of the DuBois Clubs and a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, was selected by the Party's leadership to be the first national chairman of the new League. The Communists also gave Tyner the help of thirty-four colleagues to serve with him as the League's central committee. One of the first moves made by the new League was to ingratiate itself with the Black Panther Party – a move which forged a definite link between the Communists and the Black Panthers.

WOMEN STRIKE FOR PEACE

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL STRIKE FOR PEACE

In 1961, Women Strike for Peace was founded by Dagmar Wilson, a free-lance illustrator and artist of Washington, D.C. The alleged circumstances surrounding the birth of WSP were described in a flattering sketch of Mrs. Wilson by Alvin Shuster ("Close-up of a 'Peace Striker,' " *New York Times* magazine, May 6, 1962). Shuster's piece, which has been used by WSP as promotional literature, said: "Her crusade is in many ways informal and it started almost casually. The idea came to Mrs. Wilson one day last September while she was sitting with her husband Christopher (an aide at the British Embassy) and some friends in the backyard of her house in Georgetown. They were talking about the jailing of Bertrand Russell, in London that day, for his part in anti-nuclear bomb demonstrations.

" 'I realized this was a man who had worked all his life for peace. He was speaking out for humanity. I called up a few friends and the next thing I knew we had this women's movement. They called their friends. And they in turn called others. And they all wrote letters to friends in other cities.' "

On November 1, 1961 – less than two months after her backyard inspiration – Mrs. Wilson and her WSP conducted "strike for peace" demonstrations in sixty cities across the nation. An estimated 50,000 women marched for disarmament and against the resumption of nuclear testing by the United States and the Soviet Union. Mrs. Wilson sent letters to Mrs. Nikita Khrushchev and Mrs. John F. Kennedy, both of whom sent sympathetic responses, assuring Mrs. Wilson that their husbands, Dictator Khrushchev and President Kennedy, were working strenuously for peace.

In January 1962, Mrs. Wilson conducted a demonstration before the White House and President Kennedy gave WSP a tremendous propaganda boost by describing the feminine agitators as "extremely earnest" and "concerned as we all are of the possibility of nuclear war." (It was at this time that WSP became Women's International Strike for Peace, but in recent years the original name – WSP – has seemed to prevail in their literature.)

In February 1962, seventy members of WSP were invited to the Soviet Union's mission at the United Nations, where they met with Soviet Ambassador Valerian A. Zorin.

In April 1962, Mrs. Wilson, accompanied by Mrs. Cyrus Eaton, wife of the notorious pro-Communist industrialist, and Mrs. Martin L. King, wife of the racist agitator, led a fifty-member WSP delegation to Geneva, Switzerland, site of the perennial seventeen-nation disarmament conference. The American delegates were joined in Geneva by women from other countries. The entire group met with the Geneva-based diplomatic missions of the United States and the Soviet Union.

From Geneva, Mrs. Wilson and her cohorts sent a cable to President Kennedy, asking that he give them an American military base near the Soviet Union in order that the base could be disarmed and converted into a "cultural exchange center." Mr. Kennedy did not comply with the wishes of WSP and the delegates returned to the United States, very disappointed that they had not received a military base.

Mrs. Wilson's reaction to Mr. Kennedy's refusal was that of a woman scorned. She criticized the United States as the roadblock to peace: "I believe the Russians want to disarm. They really have everything to gain by disarming. They do not have private money tied up in the armament industry so they won't have the vested interests profiting from the arms race. If they could, they obviously would like to provide more for the material needs of their people."

Of the military base sought in vain by WSP, Mrs. Wilson said: "That would really impress them [the Russians]. They are very sensitive about the bases surrounding them. They are aware of our building of military might more and more each day. They think we are getting substantially stronger than they. The base idea is the most obvious. I sensed in Geneva the Russians are intensely fearful and terrified of war."

The U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiations for a test-ban treaty were also the object of Mrs. Wilson's attention. In her role as spokeswoman for WSP, she considered the United States government to be most unreasonable in its demand that there be inspection sites within the Soviet Union. Said Mrs. Wilson: "There are enough stations. I don't know what kind they are – all over the world able to tell what they're testing. And the Russians don't want us on their territory until we're really disarmed . . . . I think they are diffident [*sic*] to show us their marbles. And I think it is unfair for us to say we want to go in and look at them."

In April 1962, WSP held a vigil outside the White House to protest U.S. atmospheric nuclear testing. In July, WSP demonstrated at the nuclear testing site. Also in July, Mrs. Wilson led a twelve-member delegation of WSP to Moscow for a two-week visit as guests of the Soviet Women's Committee. While in Moscow, the American women distributed their literature on radiation hazards and appealed to Mrs. Nikita Khrushchev and other Russian women to join them in their anti-nuclear testing protests.

Meanwhile, in June 1962, WSP held its first national conference at Ann Arbor, Michigan. Eighty-two women from fifteen states adopted a policy statement:

"We represent a resolute stand of women in the United States against the unprecedented threat to life from nuclear holocaust.

"We are women of all races, creeds and political persuasions who are dedicated to the achievement of general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

"We cherish the right and accept the responsibility of the individual in a democratic society to act to influence the course of government.

"We demand of governments that nuclear weapons tests be banned forever, that the arms race end, and that the world abolish all weapons of destruction under United Nations safeguards.

"We urge immediate planning at local, state and national levels for a peace-time economy with freedom and justice for all.

"We urge our government to anticipate world tensions and conflicts through constructive non-military actions and through the United Nations.

"We join with women throughout the world to challenge the right of any nation or group of nations to hold the power of life or death over the world."

The WSP had no difficulty obtaining impressive nation-wide publicity in its first year of operation. Members of WSP were interviewed or profiled in *Look* magazine, the *New York Times, Nation, Redbook, New University Thought,* the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists,* the *Southern Patriot, Concern* (Methodist), *Fellowship* (of the Fellowship of Reconciliation), and on television programs conducted by Eric Sevareid, Mike Wallace, Edward P. Morgan, and Huntley-Brinkley.

In its promotional literature, the WSP (which persisted in its contention that it had no leadership) boasted: "We have caused endless discussion in local communities, by walks, vigils, forums, panels; by emblems, seals, car stickers, umbrellas; by tables in shopping centers, neighborhood meetings, letter-writing campaigns; and by distributing millions of pieces of literature (each city prepares its own) giving the facts about radiation, shelters, and the spiralling arms race . . . . We have initiated political action that has resulted in peace candidates in many states and debate on the issues between the major parties' candidates, many of whom have incorporated our concerns in their major platforms. We 'Lobby by Proxy' in Washington on behalf of women throughout the nation." (In 1962, at the Moscow World "Peace" Congress, Ruth Gage-Colby, the international coordinator for WSP, said: "Women's Strike for Peace has not organized. They have no elections, no officers, no dues. They are a network of rapid communication, using telephones, telegrams and group visits to government officials on chartered buses, trains and planes.")

The WSP, despite the disclaimers that it was not an organization but only a movement, certainly attracted attention. Arnold Johnson, a spokesman for the Communist Party, described the WSP as the "most vital mass force in the peace movement of our country today." And, in the summer of 1962, the WSP "movement" had made so much headway that the House Committee on Un-American Activities decided to investigate it.

The HCUA struck pay dirt when it decided "to determine the extent of Communist infiltration in peace organizations . . . with special reference to the Women Strike for Peace." On December 6, 1962, the "non-organization" WSP went into action by sending telegrams from its Washington office, urging members of WSP to volunteer as witnesses in the HCUA hearings. During the course of the hearings, which were held on December 11, 12, and 13, Counsel Alfred Nittle, in remarks directed to Dagmar Wilson, said: "I am quite sure, Mrs. Wilson, it will please you to know that in response to your telegram Mr. [Francis] Walter [HCUA's Chairman] has received a large number of telegrams and letters protesting the committee hearings. I might add, incidentally, that this is a further indication that, despite the claims of Women Strike for Peace, they are pretty well 'organized.' However, one thing that impresses the committee is the fact that a considerable number of these communications have come from persons who have been publicly identified in testimony before this committee and other agencies as members of the Communist Party."

During the course of the three-day hearings, which were held by an HCUA subcommittee under the chairmanship of Clyde Doyle (D.-Cal.), twelve WSP leaders testified: Blanche Hofrichter Posner, Rose Clinton, Ruth Meyers, Lyla Hoffman, Elsie Neidenberg, Sylvia

Contente, Iris Freed, Anna Mackenzie, Ceil Gross, Jean Brancato, Miriam Chesman, and Dagmar Wilson.

Mrs. Posner was represented by Attorney Victor Rabinowitz, Mrs. Meyers by Attorney Leonard Boudin, Mrs. Wilson by Attorney Speiser of the American Civil Liberties Union, and the rest of the women by Attorney Telford Taylor.

Mrs. Posner, Mrs. Meyers, Mrs. Neidenberg, Mrs. Contente, Miss Clinton, Mrs. Freed, Mrs. Gross, Mrs. Brancato, and Mrs. Chesman invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about their Communist Party membership and/or activities. Mrs. Posner, Mrs. Neidenberg, Mrs. Contente, Miss Clinton, Mrs. Gross, Mrs. Chesman, and Mrs. Brancato invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked about WSP membership and/or activities. Mrs. Meyers invoked the Fifth Amendment when asked whether she knew Dagmar Wilson. Mrs. Hoffman admitted Communist Party membership in the past but declined to tell the HCUA whether she had ever formally resigned from the Communist Party. She also refused to state whether she knew Dagmar Wilson. Mrs. Mackenzie refused to state whether she had been, or was currently, a member of the Communist Party. She also refused to testify as to her WSP activities.

Dagmar Wilson answered all questions posed by the Chairman and Counsel of the HCUA subcommittee. For the most part, however, her testimony was an exemplary bit of doubletalk and evasion. She denied being any kind of leader in WSP. She admitted her role as founder but added that every woman in the "movement" was a leader, working on her own initiative for the cause of peace. By her logic, there were no leaders, but everyone was a leader. The tenor of her testimony was that WSP was similar to Harriet Beecher Stowe's Topsy: it just grew. It was all rather vague, but there could be no doubt that the leader-less WSP could amass tens of thousands of women in simultaneous demonstrations in scores of cities, shouting the same slogans, distributing the same literature, and brandishing identical picket signs.

Near the conclusion of Mrs. Wilson's appearance as a witness, Counsel Nittle asked her if she "would knowingly permit or encourage a Communist Party member to occupy a leadership position" in WSP. Mrs. Wilson replied: "Well, my dear sir, I have absolutely no way of controlling, do not desire to control, who wishes to join in the demonstrations and the efforts that the women strikers have made for peace." Mr. Nittle asked: "Am I correct then, in assuming that you plan to take no action designed to prevent Communists from assuming positions of leadership in the movement or to eliminate Communists who may have already obtained such positions?" Mrs. Wilson's answer on this occasion was unequivocal: "Certainly not."

Incredible as it may seem, after three days of testimony which showed that WSP leadership was saturated by Communist Party influences, the subcommittee's chairman Clyde Doyle gushed to Dagmar Wilson: "I want to thank you on behalf of the committee and the U.S. Congress for appearing and being so helpful to us. I want to emphasize that the committee recognizes that there are many, many, many women, in fact a great, great majority of women, in this peace movement who are absolutely patriotic and absolutely adverse to everything the Communist Party stands for. We recognize that you are one of them. We compliment you on your leadership and on your helpfulness to us this morning."

The Communist Party appreciated the performance of Mrs. Wilson and her WSP colleagues before the HCUA subcommittee. Cognizant that any investigating committee would have difficulty investigating a Communist front with no formal organization, no officers, no members, and no records, Communist Party spokesman Arnold Johnson claimed that the women of the WSP "movement" had "confounded the House Un-American Activities Committee during those dramatic hearings when the peace-women won the support of the press and the public."

The HCUA hearings did not stall the growth of WSP and, by the end of 1963, as they celebrated their second anniversary, the non-leaders of WSP were claiming a membership (adherents!) of 500,000 – all of them leaders. So important did WSP become that it assumed responsibility for the National Information Clearing House, which has been a coordinating body for peace groups in the United States, especially those groups which are most respected by the World Council for Peace. (The WCP, according to Laszlo M. Taubinger ["Doves and Stool-pigeons," *National Review,* December 15, 1964], "was and is the organization responsible for Communist penetration throughout the non-Communist world. It is the center to which leaders of all Communist-led movements and activist groups within non-Communist organizations go to report and receive instructions.")

In 1963, Dagmar Wilson – along with Russ Nixon, the general manager of the Communist weekly *National Guardian,* and Donna Allen, a prominent and active member of WSP – interceded with the State Department to gain entry into the United States for Kaoru Yasui, a prominent Japanese Communist and a recipient of the Lenin "Peace" Prize. The intercession was successful and Yasui visited the United States on a ten-day speaking tour.

In 1964, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which – at that time – was charged with the responsibility of surveillance over the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act of 1952, investigated the visit of Communist Yasui as part of a study to determine whether U.S. government agencies were improperly granting special waivers to foreigners who should not be allowed to enter the United States. From March 12 to September 9, 1964, the HCUA held nine *executive* sessions in its study of the waiver practices. On December 7, 1964, Nixon and the two ladies from WSP, Dagmar Wilson and Donna Allen, appeared under subpoena at HCUA's tenth executive session. It was explained that they had been summoned because of their role in arranging Yasui's visit and because testimony heard in previous executive sessions indicated that they might have information as to possible abuses of the immigration laws by U.S. government agencies.

Nixon protested that HCUA was in executive session and refused to be sworn to testify unless the hearing were made public. The ladies from WSP were equally stubborn and uncooperative. Mrs. Wilson was sworn, but refused to answer questions and also protested the executive nature of the hearing. Donna Allen took an affirmation, rather than an oath. She refused to give her name and address or to answer any questions of the HCUA in protest to the executive session. On December 10, 1964, the HCUA voted unanimously to report the conduct of the three witnesses to the Speaker of the House. On December 11, the Speaker certified to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia that Allen, Wilson, and Nixon were in contempt of Congress. On December 30, the three witnesses were indicted by a federal grand jury on charges of contempt. On February 26, 1965, defense motions to dismiss the indictments were denied and the three were tried and found guilty of the charges on April 8. On June 4 each of the defendants was sentenced to pay a fine of $100 and to serve jail terms of four to twelve months, the execution of the sentences being suspended. The three defendants then successfully appealed their convictions to the U.S. Court of Appeals. (A national committee, Defenders of 3 against HCUA, had been organized to raise funds for Allen, Wilson, and Nixon, and was publicized in the Communist press. At the same time, Women Strike for Peace placed an advertisement in the *New York Times,* under the heading: "Please Stop Harassing Us." Donna Allen and Dagmar Wilson were described as "two Washington, D.C. housewives" and "leaders of Women Strike for Peace," an organization which "has nothing to hide." Nothing was said in the advertisement about the fact that Donna Allen combined her leadership in WSP with her work for the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, a Communist front which had as its executive director Frank Wilkinson, the Communist Party's principal agent to organize demonstrations against HCUA. Nor was anything said about the fact that Dagmar Wilson was a sponsor of Wilkinson's Communist front.)

On December 2, 1964, five hundred WSP adherents demonstrated at the United Nations where the Nineteenth General Assembly was convening. The women carried placards: "For World Peace – Admit China to the UN" – "Extend the Test Ban Treaty – Start Talks with China Now." A month later, the tie-in between WSP and the Communists was underlined when Ruth Gage-Colby, the international coordinator of WSP, was a speaker – together with Communist Party leader Gus Hall – at the fortieth anniversary celebration of International Publishers, the Communist Party's official publishing house.

By 1965, Dagmar Wilson and her WSP were devoting less of their energies to hysterical outbursts against nuclear testing, and were concentrating on the Vietnam War. Through "teach-ins" and marches and newspaper advertisements, they followed the Communist line by portraying the United States as a barbaric aggressor against innocent Vietnamese women and children caught up in a "civil war." Said WSP, in one of its widely-printed newspaper ads: "One neglected pathway to peace is the United Nations. We ask that the United States honor its commitment to world law by a formal submission of the Vietnam dispute to the U.N. We ask for a United Nations *cease fire and free election* in South Vietnam. The Vietnamese may elect leaders we don't like. They may choose a form of government we despise – but that's their affair, as our elections are our own affair."

In July 1965, a ten-member delegation of WSP went to Jakarta, Indonesia, where it met with a delegation of Viet Cong and North Vietnamese women. The American and Communist women signed a declaration deploring U.S. "military aggression" and calling for "American women to work with dedication to stop the war in Vietnam." The United States was charged with violating the 1954 Geneva agreements and with using Vietnam as a "testing ground for new and more horrible weapons." Mrs. Mary Clarke of Los Angeles, spokesman for the WSP delegates, said her group went to Jakarta hoping to explore the possibility of a negotiated settlement of the war and "to change Administration policy on Vietnam." Indonesia's Communist President Achmed S. Sukarno told the WSP delegates how happy he was that they had chosen Indonesia as their meeting place with the Communist women for their talks on "world peace." The Communist press in this country and elsewhere was delirious in its praise of the WSP junket. And when the WSP delegates returned to the United States, they were guests at a combined cocktail party-press conference at Dagmar Wilson's home. The newsmen, representing the American and foreign press, were told by the WSP that thousands of peace-loving North Vietnamese civilians were victims of American poison gas and that American planes repeatedly strafed hospitals, schools, and nurseries. (The WSP women knew these "facts" were true because the North Vietnamese women, who met them in Jakarta, had told them so!)

If there had ever been any doubt of the close relationship between WSP and the Communists, it was dispelled in many ways by 1965. The WSP was, by 1965, advertising its program in Communist publications, and the Communists reciprocated by giving the WSP completely favorable publicity in their journals.

In 1966, the WSP initiated the Voter's Peace Pledge, which was publicized through advertisements in newspapers and magazines. Contributions, payable to WSP, were solicited from the hoped-for pledgers who were asked to sign a coupon: "I pledge to vote for – *and only for* – those candidates who agree to dedicate their efforts to stop sending American boys to kill and be killed in Vietnam; to stop the bombing and the military build-up; to urge a realistic role for the National Liberation Front (Vietcong) in peace talks and in planning Vietnamese elections; and to stop spending for wars against people, use the money for wars on poverty, disease, and inequality."

In 1966, Mrs. Mary Clarke, the WSP leader who had led the WSP delegates to Indonesia in 1965, visited Moscow where she granted an interview to the *New Times.* Mrs. Clarke, who was invited to Moscow by the "Soviet Peace Committee," told the *New Times'* correspondent, Vladimir Zhukov, of WSP's work. She maintained the fiction that WSP was only a movement: "I should like to say that we are not an organization in the true sense of the word. Participation in our movement is on a strictly voluntary basis. Apart from one employee in our Washington office, we have not a single functionary and do not pay any membership fees. All we have is a common statement on the aims of the Women Strike for Peace, and it is interpreted in each city as the local conditions require it. When we have to launch a nation-wide campaign, we contact one another by long-distance telephone and agree on what each one of us is to do and how."

Mrs. Clarke did not mention WSP's earlier obsession with demonstrations against nuclear testing and for disarmament. Instead, she dwelt on the Vietnam War and American domestic problems: "Our main job is to put an end to the war in Vietnam, get the belligerents to conclude an armistice, obtain recognition for the South Vietnam National Liberation Front, and see to it that all issues are settled on the basis of the Geneva agreements . . . . We make use of every form of propaganda to acquaint as many Americans as possible with the aims of the Women Strike for Peace . . . . "

Following the line laid down by Martin L. King and other civil rights agitators, Mrs. Clarke told *New Times* how "American social problems are closely linked with the struggle for a ceasefire in Vietnam." She elaborated: "The present phase in the struggle for peace in the United States is distinguished by efforts to coordinate the activities of the various anti-war groups and the movements for civil rights, against poverty, and so on. We are prompted by life itself to seek such cooperation. For it is clear that the Vietnam war, which is costing billions of dollars, hampers the solution of the Negro and poverty problems."

Mrs. Clarke also indulged in some "class-conscious" remarks, so appropriate in a Communist magazine: "There is another thing I should like to say. The boys fighting in South Vietnam come mainly from the poor classes. The percentage of Negroes in Vietnam is almost twice their percentage in the population of the United States. The explanation is simple: the sons of rich families can avoid military service by enrolling in universities and colleges – they're not drafted then. The poor cannot afford higher education."

In June 1967, the Communists announced formation of a new front, the Tri-Continental Information Center. One of the sponsors of the new front was WSP leader Donna Allen.

In August 1967, Dagmar Wilson and two other members of WSP journeyed to Hanoi to meet with the North Vietnamese Women's Union. The trip was made in defiance of a State Department ban against travel to the enemy's territory, but Mrs. Wilson is evidently immune from any punishment by federal officials. Upon her return from North Vietnam, she pulled out all the stops with her bleeding-heart drivel: "I felt so passionately angry I wanted to take up a gun and shoot back [at Amerian bombers]. I never thought I'd want to do that in my life." – "It's so fiendish. Here you are tilling the fields or walking to school and you think, 'Where are we supposed to go? What are we supposed to do?' Taking a gun in your hand is the only kind of relief you can have – or running for shelter which is what we did. All one's normal feelings of national loyalty go out the window. You have no idea who the enemy is – the enemy is war and violence. It's a fallacy that bombing will weaken them [the North Vietnamese]. Everything we were feeling was not as intense as what they were feeling."

Ho chi Minh could not have improved upon Mrs. Wilson's observations that he could not be bullied into peace negotiations. To Mrs. Wilson, her visit to the enemy's land "is more like visiting a family. They are totally united. Everyone suffers together and they understand each other's sufferings. There's a need to take in the children whose parents have been killed – they become everybody's children." She found a "totally unified" Vietnam: "I don't think there's anyone left in Vietnam, north or south, who isn't with the resistant movement [*sic*] against America. It's only the few who profit from the American presence who are loyal."

In September 1967, WSP adherents staged a sit-in outside the White House. Earlier they had rallied a short distance away where Mrs. Wilson, calling upon her North Vietnamese experiences, told her followers that "the morale of the North Vietnamese is absolutely superb, and I can understand why. You sit at a table in a dugout and hear those American planes and you want to get up and shoot them down yourself."

In October 1967, the WSP took part in massive "peace" demonstrations at the Pentagon, in conjunction with David Dellinger's National Mobilization Committee, the Communist Party, the DuBois Clubs, the Socialist Workers Party, and other groups of the extreme left. (It was all part of what Dagmar Wilson called a "second front" in North Vietnam's fight against U.S. "aggression.")

In 1968, the WSP stepped up its political activity. Its leaders were involved with the planning of the demonstrations to disrupt the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. After assuming some of the credit for forcing Lyndon B. Johnson into retirement, the WSP actively campaigned against Hubert Humphrey (he was too anti-Communist!) and urged its members to support the candidacy of either Robert F. Kennedy or Eugene McCarthy.

In 1969, a three-member delegation from WSP visited Hanoi at the invitation of the North Vietnam Women's Union. In North Vietnam and upon their return to the United States, the WSP delegates proved to be very effective propagandists for the North Vietnamese cause. And, as was the case with Dagmar Wilson in 1967, the WSP women – no matter how much common sense dictated that they were actively aiding and abetting the enemy – remained immune from any punitive action by the federal government.

Biographical Dictionary Of The Left

MORRIS ABRAM was born on June 19, 1918 in Fitzgerald, Georgia, son of Irene Cohen and Sam Abram. He married Jane Maguire. He is an alumnus of the University of Georgia (A.B., 1938); the University of Chicago (J.D., 1940); and Oxford University (B.A., 1948; M.A., 1953), where he held a Rhodes scholarship.

In 1940, Abram began to practice law in Atlanta. From 1941 until 1945, he was in the U.S. Army Air Corps as an intelligence officer and public relations officer. In 1946, he was a member of the prosecution staff of the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, Germany. In 1948, he resumed his law practice in Atlanta, after serving for a short time during that year as an assistant to the director of the Committee for the Marshall Plan.

The highlights of Abram's Atlanta law career included his successful fight against Georgia's county unit voting statute, which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, and his equally successful fight against Georgia's laws against insurrection and illegal assembly, which were declared unconstitutional by a federal district court.

In 1951, Abram was regional counsel for the federal government's Wage Stabilization Board. In 1955, he was counsel for the southern regional board of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. From 1956 until 1958, he was chairman of the Atlanta chapter of the ultra-liberal American Jewish Committee. (From 1962 until 1965, he was chairman of the AJC's national executive board, and he was the AJC's president from 1964 until 1968. The AJC's flair for anti-anti-Communist activism became especially evident during Abram's tenure as board chairman and president. But, for coloration, the AJC periodically criticizes the Soviet Union for anti-Semitism.)

Abram has a long history in the area of civil rights agitation. He was co-sponsor of the first large racially integrated housing project financed by the Federal Housing Administration in Atlanta. In October 1960, during the Kennedy-Nixon presidential campaign, when Martin L. King Jr. was in an Atlanta jail, Abram negotiated telephone conversations between John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy and Mayor William Hartsfield of Atlanta. The Kennedys' arm-twisting tactics resulted in King's release. Then, Abram arranged for presidential candidate John F. Kennedy to call Mrs. King in order to express his sympathy and to reassure her of King's safety. The well-publicized calls arranged by Abram were generally considered to be significant political coups for the Kennedy campaign, and Abram became firmly entrenched in the Kennedy camp.

In 1961, when President Kennedy established the Peace Corps, he appointed Abram as its general counsel. Abram wrote the guidelines used by the Corps in selecting candidates for overseas service. And, at one time, Kennedy offered Abram the ambassadorship to Tanganyika. Abram declined such overseas service for himself but accepted an appointment to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

From 1962 until 1968, Abram practiced law in New York City. As he had done in Atlanta, Abram found time to engage in many activities outside his law office. He became a member of Arthur Larson's anti-anti-Communist National Council for Civic Responsibility and Franklin Littell's anti-anti-Communist Institute for American Democracy, a department of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Abram as the U.S. representative to the Human Rights Commission of the UN's Economic and Social Council. In 1966, Abram was a member of the White House Conference on Civil Rights, and in 1967, Mr. Johnson appointed him to the National Advisory Council of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In 1966, Abram served as a co-chairman of a New York City committee (Federated Associations for Impartial Review) to combat the efforts of the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, which was determined to overturn the civilian-dominated police review board established by the ultra-leftist Mayor John Lindsay. Abram suffered a defeat on this occasion.

In 1968, the late Robert F. Kennedy decided to back Abram as a candidate for the U.S. Senate to replace the incumbent ultra-leftist Republican Jacob Javits. Kennedy's strategem foundered when, in an attempt to build up Abram's image as a foreign policy expert, an Abram statement (approved by Kennedy) on the Vietnam War was issued. The statement called on President Johnson to become even more dovish than his no-win policy. When President Johnson refused to bend to Abram's (née Kennedy's) wiles, the senatorial candidacy was forgotten. The Liberal Establishment, however, did not forget Abram. Almost simultaneously with Abram's announcement that he was withdrawing his candidacy came the news that he had been chosen as successor to President Abraham Sachar of Brandeis University.

In September 1968, Abram assumed his position at Brandeis. Within five months, the university's campus was racked by an explosive takeover by black militant students. Predictably, Abram quailed before the outrageous demands of the revolutionaries. In 1966, as president of the American Jewish Committee, when Abram had been faced with vehement anti-Jewish castigation from militant Negro leaders, he had said: "When people strike out, especially people who have been deprived, they usually strike out against their friends first. This is tragic but it is a fact." With that turn of the cheek, Abram had instructed the American Jewish Committee's units across the country to strengthen their civil rights efforts, and to step up their programs for job integration, training, and upgrading, for quality integrated education, and for closer cooperation with Negro religious, civic, labor, and business groups. In 1969, when the revolutionaries took over the Brandeis campus, Abram said: "I am not angry, I cannot forget that these are Brandeis students, terribly wrong as they are . . . . I have confidence that reason will prevail."

The black revolutionaries prevailed – not reason, not the scholastic welfare of the majority of the university's students, and not the integrity of the university's administration.

Shortly after Abram became Brandeis' president, he resigned as U.S. representative to the UN's Human Rights Commission. He praised President Johnson's domestic achievements in the field of human rights, but advised the President that the United States must do more in the international area. When newsmen later asked Abram to explain what he meant, he called on the United States to condemn all violators of human rights – even allied nations. And he suggested that the United States investigate conditions in Greece and Haiti. (He did not suggest an investigation of human rights violators in the Soviet Union or anywhere else in the Communist bloc.)

Abram has never traveled in Communist fronts, but his leftwing credentials are impeccable. He is a director of the African-American Institute, which propagandizes against the few remaining anti-Communist regimes in Africa. He is a trustee of the Twentieth Century Fund and president of the Field Foundation, both of which have a long history of supporting leftists. He is a trustee of Morehouse College, which from 1940 to 1968 was the bailiwick of President Benjamin Mays, a veteran of Communist front activity and racial agitation. He was a resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a trustee of the Foreign Policy Association, which, with its publications, has been a highly effective outlet for pro-Communist propaganda. He is a trustee of the National Urban League, which under the leadership of the suave but militant Whitney Young has moved into the middle of the black revolutionary agitation that has plagued the nation in recent years.

JOHN J. ABT was born in Chicago on May 1, 1904. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago (Ph.B., 1924; J.D., 1926).

From 1927 until 1933, Abt had a private law practice in Chicago. In 1933, at the behest of two influential New Dealers (Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes and Jerome N. Frank), he went to work for the federal government.

From 1933 until 1935, Abt was an attorney for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. In 1935, he was the assistant general counsel of the Works Progress Administration. In 1935 and 1936, on loan from the WPA, Abt was an attorney for the Securities and Exchange Commission. In 1936 and 1937, he was chief counsel to the La Follette Committee (the Senate Subcommittee on Civil Liberties), and in this position he supervised Charles Kramer, Charles Flato, and Allan Rosenberg – all of whom would later plead the privilege of the Fifth Amendment against self-incrimination when questioned about their affiliations with the Communist Party. In 1937, he concluded his government employment after serving as a special assistant to the Attorney General in the anti-trust division of the Justice Department.

In 1938, Abt became special counsel to Sidney Hillman's Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, CIO. In 1944, when Hillman inaugurated the CIO's Political Action Committee, Abt became general counsel of the ACW and co-counsel of the CIOPAC. (On November 6, 1953, the Attorney General of the United States, Herbert Brownell, stated publicly that members of Victor Perlo's group of Soviet espionage agents met in Abt's apartment when Abt was general counsel of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers).

In 1948, Abt became special counsel to the Communist-dominated Progressive Party and was a delegate to the party's annual convention. In 1950, he was a member of the party's national committee. In 1952, he was secretary of the party's platform committee and a member of the committee on candidates' declaration. In 1954, the Progressive Party held a dinner in celebration of Abt's fiftieth birthday.

Abt has been affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims (a Communist Party project); *Soviet Russia Today* (a "Communist-front publication," edited by Abt's wife, Jessica Smith Ware); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); and Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front").

In 1945, Abt visited the Soviet Union, where he was favorably impressed by the Communist regime's prosecutors, judges, and trials. In 1946, he was an adviser to the conference of the Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions held in Paris. In the following year, he was a delegate to the WFTU's conference in Prague. In 1958, he applied for and obtained a passport in order to attend the twenty-first congress of the Soviet Union's Communist Party.

Since 1948, Abt has been a defense attorney for the Communist Party and for individual Communists. He has also accompanied clients as they testified before Congressional investigating committees, where Abt's clients invariably have pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment when interrogated about affiliation with the Communist Party or Communist fronts.

On July 31, 1948, Elizabeth Bentley testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Miss Bentley, a self-confessed Communist agent and courier, identified Abt as a member of the Communist Party, in charge of a Soviet espionage group.

On August 3, 1948, in testimony before the HCUA, Whittaker Chambers, who was also a self-confessed Communist agent and courier, identified Abt as an original member of Harold Ware's espionage cell. (In the cell with Abt were – among others – Alger Hiss, Nathan Witt, Nathaniel Weyl, and Lee Pressman. After Ware's death, Witt became the cell's leader. Later Abt became the leader. Abt also married Ware's widow Jessica Smith, who for many years was editor of *Soviet Russia Today* and who is currently editor of its successor, *New World Review* – a quarterly propaganda organ, published by the Communist Party.)

On August 24, 1948, also in testimony before the HCUA, Louis Budenz, formerly managing editor of the *Daily Worker* and formerly a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party, USA, identified Abt as a member of the Communist Party. On August 28, 1950, Lee Pressman, in testimony before the HCUA, admitted his own previous membership in the Ware cell and identified Abt as a fellow cell-member. On February 19, 1952, Nathaniel Weyl, testifying before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, admitted his own previous membership in the Ware cell and identified Abt as a fellow cell-member.

On August 20 and September 1, 1950, before the HCUA, and on May 26, 1953, before the SISS, Abt was given an opportunity to affirm or to deny his Communist Party membership and his association with Communists. On all three occasions Abt chose to invoke the Fifth Amendment on the ground that he preferred not to incriminate himself.

To the present time, Abt has never publicly admitted membership in the Communist Party. His open association with Communists, however, is a matter of continuous record in the pages of the Communist press. He was a guest at the *Worker's* annual banquet in 1965, and in the same year he was the honored guest at the *National Guardian's* annual dinner.

In 1957, when the Soviet Union's famous spy Rudolf Abel was apprehended by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, he sought the legal services of Abt. Abt declined, saying that he was too busy with other work. Six years later, in the wake of President Kennedy's assassination, the alleged killer, Lee Harvey Oswald, tried to obtain Abt as his defense attorney but was unable to reach him by telephone.

THEODORE ACHILLES was born on December 29, 1905 in Rochester, New York, son of Gertrude Strong and Henry Achilles. He married Marian Field. He is an alumnus of Stanford University (A.B., 1925). From 1926 until 1928, he pursued graduate studies at Yale University.

From 1928 until 1930, Achilles was a newspaper reporter in California and Japan. Between 1931 and 1962, when he retired, he was in the Department of State. From 1931 until 1947, he held minor posts in Havana, Rome, Washington, London, and Brussels. From 1947 until 1949, he was chief of the division of Western European Affairs. In 1949, he was deputy director in the Office of European Affairs. In 1949 and 1950, he was director of the Office of Western European Affairs. In 1950, he was director of the planning staff in the Bureau of European Affairs. From 1950 until 1952, he was vice deputy of the U.S. mission to the North Atlantic Council, with the rank of minister. From 1952 until 1956, he was a U.S. minister in Paris. From 1956 until 1960, he was U.S. Ambassador to Peru. In 1960, he was counselor to the Department of State in Washington. In 1961 and 1962, he was a special assistant to Secretary of State Dean Rusk and also served as director of the Department of State's Operations Center. During his career in the Department of State, he was active on U.S. delegations to the United Nations. He attended conferences of NATO, CENTO, SEATO, the Colombo Plan, and the International Labor Organization. Since 1963, he has served as a consultant to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Achilles has been a long-time nonresident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been affiliated with Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent. He has been an official in Clarence Streit's leftist-internationalist complex: Federal Union, the International Movement for

Atlantic Union, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the Atlantic Council of the United States. He is on the advisory council of the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University, together with a host of perennial foreign policy makers from the ruling Establishment.

GEORGE D. AIKEN was born on August 20, 1892 in Dummerston, Vermont, son of Myra Cook and Edmund Aiken. He married Beatrice Howard. He is a high-school graduate. He has been a successful commercial horticulturist.

From 1930 until 1934, Aiken was a member of Vermont's House of Representatives; in 1933 and 1934, he was its Speaker. From 1935 until 1937, he was Lieutenant-Governor of Vermont, and in 1937, he was elected to a four-year term as Governor.

In 1940, Aiken was elected to fill the unexpired term of the deceased U.S. Senator Ernest W. Gibson. Aiken has since been re-elected to successive terms in the Senate.

During his thirty years in the Senate, Aiken has moved from a relatively conservative position to the far left wing of the Republican Party. In the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, he was a staunch supporter of ultra-liberal legislation, especially in the area of civil rights and welfare programs. But it is in the area of foreign policy that Aiken has earned his credentials as a leftwinger. He is the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, where his dovishness compares favorably with that of Chairman J. William Fulbright (D.-Ark.).

Aiken was one of the earliest critics of the Vietnam War to bemoan "escalation" and bombing of North Vietnam. The continuance of the war, according to Aiken, would bring on a nuclear holocaust. He supports the ultra-leftwing, pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. So far to the left has he gone, that the ultra-leftist National Committee for an Effective Congress has given him its financial support and political endorsement.

ANTHONY B. AKERS was born on October 19, 1914 near Charlotte, Texas, son of Margaret Long and Ambrose Akers. He married Jane Pope. He is an alumnus of the University of Texas (B.A., 1936) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1949).

From 1936 until 1939, Akers was a public school teacher in Texas and California. From 1940 until 1946, he served in the U.S. Navy. In 1950, he began his private law practice, which has continued to the present except for periods when he was in public service. From 1951 until 1953, he was in the Office of Secretary of the Air Force as a deputy assistant secretary and deputy undersecretary. From 1955 until 1958, he was director in New York City of the New York State Department of Commerce. He was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress in 1954, 1956, and 1958. In 1960, he was executive chairman of New York Citizens for Kennedy and Johnson. As a reward for his campaign work, he was appointed by President Kennedy to be United States Ambassador to New Zealand and held the post from 1961 until 1963.

Akers is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a trustee of Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism. He is on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle.

SADIE T.M. ALEXANDER was born (c. 1900) in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (née Sadie Tanner Mossell). She married Raymond Alexander. She is an alumna of the University of Pennsylvania (B.S., LL.B., M.A., Ph.D.). She was admitted to the Pennsylvania bar in 1927.

Since 1927, Mrs. Alexander has had a law practice in Philadelphia. From 1928 until 1930 and from 1934 until 1938, she was an assistant city solicitor of Philadelphia. She has lectured at universities in Norway, Sweden, Finland, the Soviet Union, Hawaii, the West Indies, the Philippines, South America, and Asia. For twenty-five years, she was secretary of the National Urban League. She was a member of President Harry S. Truman's Commission on Civil Rights. Since 1952, she has been on Philadelphia's Commission on Civil Rights.

Mrs. Alexander has been an official of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. She has been a member of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee and International Movement for Atlantic Union. She has been affiliated with the leftist-pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. She has been a member of the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"). She has been a national officer of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness.

JAMES E. ALLEN JR. was born on April 25, 1911 in Elkins, West Virginia, son of Susan Garrott and James E. Allen. He married Florence Miller. He is an alumnus of Davis and Elkins College (A.B., 1932) and Harvard University (M. Ed., 1942; Ed. D., 1945).

From 1934 until 1939, Allen was with West Virginia's State Education Department. In 1939 and 1940, he pursued graduate studies at Princeton University and was a research associate with Princeton Surveys. From 1941 until 1943, he was a researcher in the Center for Research in Educational Administration at Harvard University. In 1943, he was secretary to Harvard's faculty and was also the placement director at Harvard's Graduate School of Education. In 1944 and 1945, he was an educational consultant to the War Department. In 1945 and 1946, while holding the rank of assistant professor of education, he was the director of the school services bureau at Syracuse University. In 1946 and 1947, he was a consultant to President Truman's Commission on Higher Education. From 1947 until 1950, he was executive assistant to New York State's Commissioner of Education. From 1950 until 1955, he was New York State's Deputy Commissioner of Education. From 1955 until 1969, he was Commissioner of Education and President of New York State's university system. In 1969, he was appointed by President Nixon to be the United States Commissioner of Education and Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Until Allen became New York State's Commissioner of Education, he was rather an obscure bureaucratic educationist. In that position, however, he became known as one of the nation's foremost exponents of radical-liberal theories of education. He postured as an ardent advocate of local control of public schools.

In 1961, speaking to the New York State School Boards Association, Allen said of local control: "It encompasses all the things that a school board is responsible for – the employment of a teacher;

the determination of how many teachers are needed and how they should be assigned to achieve the best teaching results; the fixing of the school calendar and the length of the school day; the determination of what courses are to be taught, of how students are to be grouped for instruction, of what supplies and equipment are to be purchased, etc. With such breadth and diversity of responsibility, there is virtually no limit to the opportunities available to a school board to improve the quality of education under its control." In this same address, however, Allen warned that "local control can continue to exist only so long as it produces good education." Who would decide what was "good" education? Allen made it quite clear that he and his fellow educationists on the state level would set the standards: "In our supervisory role we must be unremitting and unswerving in our insistence upon high standards of performance at the local level so that this concept can be defended as a fruitful means of fostering the quality of education imperative to our Nation."

Once Allen became U.S. Commissioner of Education, he was no longer content to have the individual state educationist hierarchies control the local controllers. He announced that "we need to develop a kind of nationwide strategy for the improvement of education," thereby relegating the local controllers to a tertiary position under the paternalistic federal government.

When Allen entered his federal office in the Nixon Administration, the federal government was spending three billion dollars annually on elementary and secondary education. Allen, however, complained about the scarcity of federal funds and expressed the hope that the federal government would soon assume 25 or 30 per cent of the national cost for elementary and secondary education, rather than a mere 8 per cent.

To his federal office, Allen brought a well-deserved reputation as a fanatical racial integrationist. As the virtual dictator of New York's public school system, he had insisted that children should be bused from their own neighborhoods and communities to eliminate racial imbalance from schools. In a definition that provided aid and comfort to white and black racial militants, Allen decided that a racially imbalanced school was one in which 50 per cent or more Negroes were enrolled.

Allen's busing ukases caused so much trouble in New York that the state legislature enacted a law banning the busing of students to correct racial imbalance in schools.

Although Allen's determination to integrate schools was repudiated by legislative action in New York, he continued to fan the flames of racism. When he was nominated for the education post in the Nixon Administration, he announced that urban "ghetto" schools and desegregation were priority problems he hoped to solve. In a blast of generalities, Allen said: "We have built a middle-class type of education taught by middle-class teachers and run by middle-class administrators for middle-class kids. But rarely have we provided the type of teaching that a deprived child really needs." A few months later, Allen declared: "I think the American schools, by and large, are doing a very good job." Three months after this pat on the back for American schools, Allen revealed that he was planning a national goal to be achieved by the end of the 1970's: no person will leave a school system anywhere in the country without the ability to read properly. (Evidently, the schools which, by and large, were doing a very good job were neglecting the basic task of teaching pupils how to read properly.)

To the U.S. Office of Education, Allen also brought his obsession with compulsory sex education in public schools. He argued that sex education was "essential" and a part of health and family living. He warned, however, "before any community goes into it, the schools ought to work with the community and parents. The biggest problem in sex education is not the children, but the damn parents. People [i.e., the parents of the children] get blind spots when you talk about this. They think it's sinister."

A few days after Allen took office in the Nixon Administration, he was asked by newsmen to comment upon the students who were disrupting campuses across the nation. From the Justice Department, the militants had been characterized as "tyrants," "modern ideological criminals," and "new barbarians." Allen, on the other hand, insisted that the disrupters and their sympathizers were usually the brightest and most socially concerned students on campus. Of course, Allen offered not a whit of evidence to support either this contention or his equally stupid remark that outside agitators do not start campus disturbances. He did anticipate that violence would continue on campuses but he opposed any cutoff of federal funds to colleges and universities that failed to discipline the militants. He would be content "to look at the fundamental, underlying causes of this difficulty [student violence] and try to work out answers to the problems that are raised."

DILLON ANDERSON was born on July 14, 1906 in McKinney, Texas, son of Elizabeth Dillon and Joseph Anderson. He married Lena Carroll. He is an alumnus of the University of Oklahoma (B.S., 1928) and Yale University (LL.B., 1929). He is the author of *I and Claudie* (1951); *Claudie's Kinfolks* (1954); and *The Billingsley Papers* (1961).

Since 1929, Anderson has had a law practice in Houston, Texas. He is a director of Westinghouse Electric Corporation, U.S. Plywood-Champion Papers, Federal Department Stores, and the Monsanto Company.

In 1955 and 1956, Anderson was a special assistant to President Dwight Eisenhower for national security affairs, and accompanied Eisenhower to the 1955 summit conference at Geneva. In 1959, he was a consultant to the National Security Council.

Anderson has been a long-time nonresident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a trustee of the leftist-internationalist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He has been a director of the leftist-internationalist Foreign Policy Association and of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council, and has been active in the leftist-internationalist World Affairs Council of Houston.

HURST ANDERSON was born in 1904 in Cleveland, Ohio, son of Ora Robins and Foster Anderson. He married Marian Powell. He is an alumnus of Ohio Wesleyan University (A.B., 1926) and Northwestern University (M.S., 1934).

From 1928 until 1943, Anderson was on the faculty of Allegheny College: instructor (1928-1931); assistant professor (1931-1932); associate professor (1932-1940); and professor (1940-1943). From 1943 until 1948, he was president of Centenary Junior College. From 1948 until 1952, he was president of Hamline College. From 1952 until 1968, he was president of American University. Since 1969, he has been executive director of the Methodist Corporation.

While Anderson was president of American University, the House Committee on Un-American Activities heard testimony from Herbert Fuchs, a law teacher at American University. Fuchs, an ex-Communist, admitted that prior to 1947 he had belonged to three Communist cells. However, he was reluctant to tell the HCUA about individuals who he knew were in government service and who were members of the Communist Party. Anderson issued a statement after Fuchs' refusal to testify about others: "Professor Fuchs is known in our Washington College of Law as an intelligent, loyal, and devoted teacher. He made a serious mistake in the past which he has recognized and declared. The American University therefore would support his right as a citizen to pursue his chosen professional activities, to take any other position at this time would be beneath the dignity of the institution with a Christian relationship and commitments."

After Anderson had given him a vote of confidence, Fuchs returned to the HCUA and testified fully about acquaintances he knew were Communists and, at the same time, in government service. Once Fuchs' actions were reported in the press, Anderson summoned him to his office and told him to apply for a leave of absence or face suspension. Fuchs refused and Anderson promptly recommended the dismissal of the "intelligent, loyal, and devoted teacher." (A *Saturday Evening Post* editorial of December 10, 1955 concluded, concerning the Fuchs case: "Naturally the Communist Party is pleased by any action that discourages ex-Communists from helping the United States.")

Anderson has held many high offices in various religious and educational groups, including the University Senate of the Methodist Church; the junior college council of the Middle Atlantic States Association; the New Jersey Association of Colleges and Universities; the Methodist Church's National Association of Schools and Colleges; the World Methodist Council; the Association of American Colleges; and the National Council of Churches.

Anderson's other affiliations include: Freedom House (a center for anti-anti-Communism and a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent); the International Movement for Atlantic Union (working toward a political merger of western Europe and the United States, as a major step towards world government); the United Nations Association of the United States (one world-leftwing); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); and the National Council for Civic Responsibility (Arthur Larson's anti-anti-Communist group, which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation).

WILLIAM ATTWOOD was born on July 14, 1919 in Paris, France, son of Gladys Hollingsworth and Frederic Attwood (American citizens). He married Simone Cadgene. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (B.A., 1941). He is the author of *The Man Who Could Grow Hair* (1949); *Still the Most Exciting Country* (1955); and *The Reds and the Blacks.* He is the co-author of *The Decline of the American Male* (1959).

From 1946 until 1949, Attwood was a foreign correspondent for the *New York Herald-Tribune.* From 1949 until 1951, he was a European correspondent for *Collier's* magazine. From 1951 until 1961, he was with *Look* magazine: European editor (1951-1954); national editor (1955-1957); and foreign editor (1957-1961). From 1961 until 1963, he was U.S. Ambassador to Guinea. In 1963 and 1964, he was a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador. From 1964 until 1966, he was U.S. Ambassador to Kenya. Since 1966, he has been the editor-in-chief and vice-president of Cowles Communications, Inc.

Long before Attwood entered the diplomatic service, his enormous output of writings in numerous periodicals stamped him indisputably as a certified liberal. In 1960, he went to work as a speech writer for his old friend Adlai Stevenson, who was seeking the Democratic presidential nomination. When Stevenson's campaign dissipated, Attwood became a speech writer for John F. Kennedy.

As his reward after the successful Kennedy campaign, Attwood was appointed Ambassador to Guinea. During his diplomatic novitiate of twenty-eight months in Guinea, he cultivated a strong friendship with Guinea's president Sékou Touré, a well-trained and highly disciplined Communist viceroy. Attwood found Touré to be an African and a nationalist, guilty of no more than "erratic nationalism." From his post in Guinea, Attwood – still with the rank of Ambassador – went to the United Nations, where he worked briefly under Ambassador Adlai Stevenson.

Attwood's view of the United Nations was taken through the liberals' omnipresent rose-colored glasses: " . . . I hate to think what could have happened during the past twenty years without the UN there to damp down the brush-fire wars that might otherwise have blazed into nuclear bonfires. The UN is also a place where nations can settle their quarrels without losing face; it's easier to give way to the world organization than to your opponents. And it's a great equalizer – it's where any country, no matter how small and poor and weak, can hold its own with the superpowers; it's where steam gets let off."

From the United Nations, Attwood moved on to the U.S. Ambassadorship to Kenya, where he became as friendly with the barbaric Jomo Kenyatta as he had been with Sékou Touré, Attwood found Kenyatta to be a "grand old man," whose role in the savagery of the Mau Mau uprising was debatable.

Attwood's five years as an Ambassador have been recounted in his *The Reds and the Blacks.* He has revealed himself as completely committed to the New Frontier and Great Society. His special heroes and advisors have included John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, G. Mennen "Soapy" Williams, Chester Bowles, Bill Moyers, Walt Rostow, Sargent Shriver, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Robert McNamara, and, in particular, Adlai Stevenson and Averell Harriman. In retrospect, he deplores "McCarthyism," Barry Goldwater and all Goldwaterites, and John Foster Dulles' brinkmanship.

On the African scene, Attwood worked feverishly to promote more U.S. foreign "aid" handouts, especially to economically chaotic Guinea. He constantly underrated the success of the Soviets and Red China in Africa. He became an ardent admirer of African Socialism, and was most sympathetic to the fraudulent nonaligned-neutralist posture of the new African nations. He became bitterly hostile toward the anti-Communist regimes of South Africa, Rhodesia, and the Congo under Moise Tshombe.

Touré and Kenyatta did not have a monopoly on Attwood's apologetics. He staunchly defended the role of the United Nations and the United States in crushing the Katanga secession from the Congo, although he never did explain why the Katanga secession was any business of either the United States or the UN. He showed special resentment of Portugal's attempt to preserve its African provinces from Red terrorists.

Basic to Attwood's judgments as a diplomat were his views on Communism and Communists. He could find distinctions between "good" and "bad" Communists: the Yugoslavs and Soviets vis-à-vis the Red Chinese. He was convinced that there are major cracks in the Communist movement. As late as 1967, he wrote: "The fictions are fading. Hardly anyone pretends that Formosa is China any more, and you can now question the need for our huge ($2.6 billion a year) military establishment in Europe without being accused of appeasement. And ideology is fading too. The crusaders, both Communist and anti-Communist, are dwindling on both sides of the Iron Curtain; except in [Red] China, the cool generation – the atomic age generation – is moving up, setting the pace, taking over."

In 1963, Attwood was very anxious to serve as a mediator to heal differences between the United States and Communist Cuba. His efforts, which were encouraged by Robert F. Kennedy, came to naught when President Kennedy was assassinated. Attwood, however, retained some unusual views about Fidel Castro: ". . . A long talk with Castro in 1959 convinced me he was too emotional to be a disciplined Communist, though naive enough to be swayed by Communist advisers."

When Attwood left the diplomatic service, he was somewhat critical of the bureaucratic practices of the Department of State. He seemed most concerned that foreign "aid" handouts were not dispensed in speedier fashion instead of by the cumbersome processes involving Congress, the Agency for International Development, and public opinion (which, he says, simply cannot adopt readily enough the one-worldism that is a major part of Attwood's philosophy). On the other hand, Attwood had nothing but praise for the Peace Corps and the Central Intelligence Agency. If anything, his disdain for anti-Communists and for Americans primarily concerned with America's interests had increased.

Since 1967, Attwood's contributions to leftist internationalism have been made through his editorship of *Look* magazine and his affiliations with the Institute of International Education, Planned Parenthood-World Population, and the Council on Foreign Relations.

JOAN BAEZ was born on January 9, 1941 in Staten Island, New York, daughter of Joan Bridge and Albert Baez. She married David Harris. In 1958, she attended Boston University for one month. In 1968, she was the author of *Daybreak*, which she dedicated "with love, admiration, and gratefulness to the men who find themselves facing imprisonment for resisting the draft." (At the time when *Daybreak* was published, her husband was serving a sentence in a federal penitentiary for refusing induction into the armed services.)

In 1958, Joan Baez began a career as a folksinger. Within a few years, her record albums became the best-selling items among all those made by female singers in the United States. Since 1961, she has become a familiar figure on college campuses, at rock festivals, in concert halls, and on television. Along with her folksinging, she propagandizes for pacifism, nonviolence, resistance to the draft, and forcible racial integration. (One of her repetitious messages is that girls can aid the cause of nonviolence "by refusing to sleep with anyone who carries a draft card.")

Early in her professional career, Joan Baez became a heroine to young and old Leftists. As early as 1962, she was affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"). In 1964, she was one of the first celebrities to support the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, which were organized under the auspices of the Communist Party. In 1964, she was a leader in the Free (Filthy) Speech Movement on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. In the same year, she became a supporter of the Communist-saturated grape strike in California.

In 1964, Baez began an annual ritual by declaring that she would pay no federal income taxes because of her opposition to the Vietnam War. The Internal Revenue Service collects the taxes by means of a lien, but the press gives generous publicity every year to the farce.

As an ardent admirer of Martin L. King Jr., Baez participated in racial demonstrations at Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham, Alabama. She was a star performer at the March on Washington. Her idol in the folksinging field is Pete Seeger, whose appearances at Communist gatherings around the world are legendary. In imitation of Seeger, she has traveled widely throughout Europe and Asia, giving concerts that are interspersed with preachings on pacifism and diatribes against the United States.

In 1965, Baez founded and became vice president of the Institute for the Study of Nonviolence at Carmel, California. For the presidency of the Institute, she chose Ira Sandperl, a sometime schoolteacher and full-time pacifist. (She claimed in 1966 that she had invested more than $100,000 in the Institute, which is nothing more than a series of informal seminars wherein Marxism and pacifism are the main topics.)

In 1968, Baez married David Harris, a member of The Resistance, whose refusal to accept induction won him a term in the federal penitentiary. Harris' fate led to an extensive tour of campuses by Baez, who urged others to imitate her husband. The travails of the couple have been memorialized in an eighty-minute documentary film, "Carry It On," which opened for commercial showing in New York in the summer of 1970. (The couple have also received sympathetic notices in the liberal press and in such widely-circulated publications as *McCall's* and *Look.*)

In the past few years, Joan Baez has been somewhat critical of militant demonstrators, since she believes that they are endangering the cause of nonviolence. But her leftist crusading continues. In August 1970, she appeared in Communist Poland; her performance there was televised all over Europe through the facilities of Intravision and Eurovision networks. She told Polish newsmen: "America is not the sickest, but the biggest. If Poland was as big as America, she might be just as destructive." (Baez frequently tells of how she has been under psychiatrists' guidance throughout her adulthood.)

HARDING BANCROFT was born on December 29, 1910 in New York City, son of Beatrice Jordan and Francis Bancroft. He married Jane Northrop. He is an alumnus of Williams College (A.B., 1933) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1936).

From 1936 until 1941, Bancroft practiced law in New York City. From 1941 until 1943, he was with the Office of Price Administration in Washington, D.C. For a brief period in 1943, he was with the Office of Lend-Lease Administration.

In 1945, Bancroft became a division chief in the State Department's Office of Special Political Affairs (renamed the Office of United Nations Affairs). Subsequently, he became the director of the State Department's Office of United Nations Political and Security Affairs. From 1950 until 1953, he was the deputy representative of the United States to the United Nations Collective Measures Committee and held the personal rank of minister.

Bancroft addressed the first meeting of the Collective Measures Committee, held on March 5, 1951. As spokesman for the Truman-Acheson foreign policy, he pleaded that the Collective Measures Committee speed up plans for preparing the United Nations to take quick military, political, and economic action against any new aggression. Bancroft asked the Committee to work on: "(1.) Organization and coordination of special military units to be set aside by member states for duty at the call of the United Nations. (2.) Creation of a volunteer United Nations legion. (3.) Meshing regional defense agreements into the global pattern of collective action against aggression."

In a passing reference to the Korean War, Bancroft offered the canard that "the United Nations is engaged in action against aggression." (At no time during the entire Korean War did more than fifteen of the then sixty member-nations of the UN send even token forces to fight against the armies of North Korea and Red China.) In a nation-wide radio broadcast a few hours after he had stressed the need to create a "bulwark against aggression," Bancroft insisted that the program he had outlined was not intended as an "anti-Russian [*sic*] project in any sense."

From 1953 until 1956, Bancroft was a legal adviser to the Red-riddled International Labor Organization in Geneva. From 1956 until 1963, he was secretary of The New York Times Company, and since 1963, he has been executive vice president of the organization. He is a director of several business organizations. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations. Above all, he has been regarded as a highly useful and trustworthy member of the left-liberal Establishment.

In the biweekly *Government Employees' Exchange* of April 16, 1969, Bancroft's true value to the Establishment was described in an article, "Otepka Was Major Roadblock in Takeover By a 'New Team' – *N.Y. Times* Linked to C.I.A. Plot on Official."

The article said: "The Central Intelligence Agency's 'New Team,' including such 'outsiders' as Harding A. Bancroft, now the executive vice president of the *N.Y. Times*, played a critical role in the final decision of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to press Secretary of State Dean Rusk to proceed with the dismissal of Otto F. Otepka as the State Department's top security evaluator, a former ambassador associated with

C.I.A. director Richard Helms informed this newspaper on Apr. 11.

"According to the source, Mr. Bancroft played a role because of his liaison and coordinating work involving use of the organization and facilities of the *N.Y. Times* on behalf of the C.I.A. and the 'New Team.'

"Other persons who had a role included William H. Brubeck who had been the recipient of the 1960 'leak' of top secret information from the State Department to the campaign headquarters of John Kennedy, which contributed significantly to Mr. Kennedy's narrow victory at the election polls. After Mr. Kennedy's victory, Mr. Brubeck received complete information about Mr. Otepka's role in tracing this 'leak,' the former ambassador revealed. Other members of the 'New Team' were McGeorge Bundy and his brother, William Bundy, who had moved from the Central Intelligence Agency to become the assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, including Viet Nam.

"The 'New Team' at the Central Intelligence Agency was being planned by Attorney General Robert Kennedy even before the Bay of Pigs 'fiasco' in 1961. In fact, the former ambassador said, the attorney general had a special group of his own 'monitoring' the Bay of Pigs operation to determine which persons, not yet projected for the 'New Team,' would 'pass the test.' Although the 'Bay of Pigs' was a national disaster, the source said, Robert Kennedy exploited it within the government to accelerate building the 'New Team.'

"The 'New Team' goals were set by the 'personality' of Robert Kennedy and the 'philosophy' of President John Kennedy and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, the source revealed. The main exponent of this 'philosophy' was Maj. Gen. Maxwell Taylor, assisted by McGeorge Bundy and Walt Whitman Rostow, the former ambassador said. The mission of the 'New Team' was to contest the Soviet penetration of the 'Third World,' the so-called nonaligned countries, through 'paramilitary, parapolitical and paradiplomatic' means. To do this, the 'New Team' was to be a 'paragovernment,' performing for the United States 'the same kind of functions' which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union performed for the Soviet Union, the former ambassador revealed.

"This required the 'New Team' to penetrate every department and agency of the Executive Branch dealing with foreign policy by inserting 'trusted members' of the 'New Team' into key positions. Among them were the officers of security of the State Department, the military services departments, the United States Information Agency and the Agency for International Development, the source added.

"Besides Robert Kennedy and Maxwell Taylor, other members of the 'New Team' were Gen. Marshall S. Carter, who replaced Gen. Charles B. Cabell as deputy director of the C.I.A. Very early 'recruits' to the 'New Team' were Richard Helms, today the director of the C.I.A., and Cartha 'Deke' De Loach, the second man in charge of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Together with Robert McNamara and Dean Rusk, the 'New Team,' acting under the control of Robert Kennedy, began the 'infiltration' of the State Department and the Defense Department with Central Intelligence Agency personnel. 'Counter-insurgency' projects sprung up in every agency dealing with foreign affairs.

"Besides key persons officially already in the government, the 'New Team' selected persons in leading banks, law firms and foundations for the penetration of the 'non-governmental' apparatus of the United States, the former ambassador revealed. Because of the paramount role of the *N.Y. Times* in American life and because of the 'black' assignments which it might be asked to perform for the C.I.A., great care was taken to select a person who had full access to every office in the *N.Y. Times* and yet could conceal his own operations. This was especially important because 'gray operations, involving special background briefings' for such special *N.Y. Times* representatives as James Reston and Tom Wicker were already going on, and top *N.Y. Times* reporters were in an especially good position to 'uncover' the 'black' operations.

"Harding Bancroft had been originally introduced into the State Department by Alger Hiss, and after Mr. Hiss became the head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Mr. Bancroft served under Dean Rusk as a member of the Department's Office of Special Political Affairs, renamed the Office of United Nations Affairs. Subsequently, he took the post of general counsel to the International Labor Organization in Geneva and then went to the *N.Y. Times,* eventually to be named executive vice president.

"During the Eisenhower Administration, Harding Bancroft worked closely with Dean Rusk, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, maintaining close liaison with John Foster Dulles and with Allen Dulles, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

"Because Mr. Bancroft's liaison role at the *N.Y. Times* required meetings with top C.I.A. and State Department officials, especially on matters of 'personnel,' it was decided to provide him with 'cover' by designating him a 'member' of the newly created State Department Advisory Committee on International Organization Affairs, whose task was to recommend the 'best qualified Americans' for those international organization positions in which they could make important contributions.

"Although the advisory committee eventually prepared a 'report,' which was itself controversial in its original draft form, the basic role of the committee was to provide a 'cover' for the 'New Team,' the source revealed. [The advisory committee was headed by Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland, who had chosen Bancroft along with such other luminaries of the left as Andrew W. Cordier, Ernest A. Gross, Marshall D. Shulman, Lawrence Finkelstein, Francis O. Wilcox, and Arthur Larson. The purpose of the Cleveland Committee was to make it easier for Communists and fellow travelers to obtain positions in the United Nations; and in its first report in draft form, the Cleveland Committee recommended the elimination of pre-appointment investigations for United States citizens who were being hired by the United Nations.] One of the major 'roadblocks' to the 'infiltration' of the State Department by the Central Intelligence Agency New Team was Otto F. Otepka, its top security evaluator. Mr. Otepka had already 'annoyed' Central Intelligence Agency by his 'uncovering' the activities of the C.I.A. in using 'double agents' in the Warsaw 'sex and spy' scandals . . . Mr. Otepka 'naively' continued to apply the longstanding federal and Civil Service standards in the issuance of security clearances . . . .

"Mr. Otepka's 'miscalculation' lay in his loyalty to the law and regulations, the source said, and his failure to comprehend that a 'coup d'état' was about to take place, in which the 'paragovernment' of the 'New Team' would displace the 'formal government' of the United States . . . he insisted that members of the newly-designated Advisory Committee on International Organization Affairs could not be 'cleared' without a 'full field check' by the F.B.I. . . . Mr. Otepka produced from his security files information that in 1946 . . . Ambassador Loy Henderson had accused Mr. Bancroft both of being under the 'influence of Mr. Hiss' and of being 'pro-Soviet.'

"In addition, Mr. Otepka then, in 1961, recalled that both Mr. Rusk and Mr. Bancroft had urged the firing of Robert Alexander, an official in the visa division of the State Department, because Mr. Alexander had told a Congressional committee that the United Nations headquarters in New York was a haven for alien communists and espionage agents, who were entering the U.S. under 'waivers' of the immigration laws. The recommendations for these 'waivers' were made by Mr. Rusk and Mr. Bancroft . . . . "

Otepka, of course, was eventually (1963) deprived of his security post in the State Department and much later (1969), as a sop to frustrated anti-Communists, was given an appointment to the almost totally dormant and ineffective Subversive Activities Control Board. Bancroft remains, however, in his influential position as executive vice president of the *New York Times.*

JACQUES BARZUN was born on November 30, 1907 in Creteil, France, son of Anne Rose and Henri Barzun. He came to the United States in 1920. He was naturalized in 1933. He married Mariana Lowell. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1927; M.A., 1928; Ph.D., 1932). He is the author of *The French Race: Theories of Its Origin* (1932); *Race: A Study in Modern Superstition* (1937); *Of Human Freedom* (1939); *Darwin, Marx, Wagner* (1941); *Teacher in America* (1945); *Berlioz and the Romantic Century* (1950); *Pleasures of Music* (1951); *God's Country and Mine* (1954); *Music in American Life* (1956); *The Energies of Art* (1956); *The Modern Researcher* (1957); *The House of Intellect* (1959); *Classic, Romantic and Modern* (1961); *Science: The Glorious Entertainment* (1964); and *The American University* (1968); and co-author of *The New Invitation to Learning* (1942) and *Romanticism and the Modern Ego* (1943).

Since 1927, Barzun has been at Columbia University: lecturer in history (1927-1929); instructor (1929-1938); assistant professor (1938-1942); associate professor (1942-1945); professor (1945-1955); dean of graduate faculties (1955-1958); dean of faculties and provost (1958-1967); and, since 1967, University Professor.

Barzun has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness; the leftist, one-world Atlantic Union Committee; and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists. He has petitioned for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, a favorite project of the Left. During World War II, he urged all-out aid to the Soviet Union, another leftist project. He has protested against loyalty oaths, also a leftist project. He joined leftwing pacifists in urging President John F. Kennedy to replace civil defense programs with a "positive program for peace with freedom."

FREDERICK S. BEEBE was born on February 20, 1914 in Utica, New York, son of Dora Sessions and Henry Beebe. He married Liane Petzl-Basny. He is an alumnus of Dartmouth College (A.B., 1935) and Yale University (LL.B., 1938).

From 1938 until 1961, Beebe was engaged in his private law practice. Since 1961, he has been chairman of the board of the Washington Post Company, owner of two of America's most persistently leftist publications – the *Washington Post* and *Newsweek* magazine.

Beebe is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy. He has been on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda. He has been an official of the United Nations Association of the United States, the most prestigious leftwing propaganda agency for the UN in this country.

HARRY BELAFONTE was born on March 1, 1927 in New York City, son of Melvine Love and Harold Belafonte. He was married to and divorced from Frances Marguerite Byrd. He is married to Julie Robinson. He was a high school dropout.

On March 2, 1959, *Time* magazine featured Belafonte as its cover story. Said *Time*, in its lead paragraph: "The young man used to ride the New York subways with a pencil in his pocket and a chip on his shoulder. Sometimes, when he saw the placards for a cosmetic lotion urging straphangers to preserve the soft white beauty of their hands, he would take out his pencil and scrawl derisive comments: 'How about Negro hands?' or 'What if you're Chinese?' Car cards urging brotherhood and tolerance got the inscription: 'There is bigotry in America.' The girl who often rode with him would remonstrate, but the young man scarcely heard her. Even then, she recalls, 'there was a storm within Harry.' "

By 1959, Belafonte was an appropriate subject for a *Time* cover story. In a little more than ten years, he had become an internationally famous entertainer as an actor on stage and in films, and as a singer on radio and television and in nightclubs. He was the first single performer to make a long-playing record album that sold more than a million copies, and by 1959, his annual income was estimated at more than $750,000.

In the *Time* story, Belafonte's racism was also indicated by an anecdote: "A friend, Painter Matthew Feinman, remembers that he [Belafonte] was seething with racial feeling. The two of them played chess, and when they were arranging the chessmen, Harry used to say: 'I'm taking the black ones, man, because they're better than the white; they're the best, man.' " Later, however, Belafonte – high-school dropout and scrawler of racist graffiti – postured as a literate and expressive egalitarian: "I have always been a disciple of integration, both on the esthetic as well as the commercial level. I am, however, terribly sensitive about the kind of integration the Negro artist, the black man, is becoming involved with. Is he to be the promulgator of the existing structures and institutions in this country? Is he, through his active participation in the involvement of black and white in all areas of creative endeavor, to further those edifices of emotional idleness that have undermined our society for generations? Or is he, through this new, meaningful integration to revitalize, to add to and to contribute a new thrust to the existing structure? I don't want to be part of the integration in which one man helps another into the tottering tower of the Establishment and the palace of pestilence which we know. I want to participate in an integration which brings pride, fulfillment and meaning to all members of all races." (Harry Belafonte, "What Kind of Integration?" *New York Times,* February 2, 1969.)

As has been the wont of so many entertainers in recent years, Belafonte became involved in leftist causes and, at times, combined his role as an entertainer with that of a radical agitator.

Nine years after *Time's* story on Belafonte, *Newsweek* magazine reported: "When Harry Belafonte agreed to substitute as host for vacationing Johnny Carson on NBC's 'Tonight Show' he decided to invite his close friends to appear. Among those who showed up last week: Bill Cosby, Sen. Robert Kennedy, Wilt Chamberlain, Zero Mostel, Marianne Moore, Sidney Poitier, Petula Clark, Paul Newman, Dr. Martin Luther King and the Smothers Brothers. [Except for Cosby, Chamberlain, and Clark, Belafonte's "close friends" are familiar to the leftwing scene] . . . .

"By the end of the first night, he [Belafonte] and his guests had already denounced governmental neglect of Negroes in Watts, mourned the high suicide rate among despondent American Indians and rebuked President Johnson over Vietnam . . . . And the Smothers Brothers told all those jokes that CBS wouldn't let them do on their show. 'I want to thank CBS,' said brother Tommy, 'for allowing us to come on NBC and do some of our distasteful material.' . . .

"One minute, he [Belafonte] would reminisce with Poitier about that time in Mississippi when the KKK chased them 10 miles into the next county. The next, he would show home movies of his wife (who is white) and children watching him and white companions water ski in Las Vegas. 'In America, it's very obvious that we are racially torn far apart,' he explains. 'Now, I could go on the air and hack away and make the point every minute, politically. But this week people saw me with a bunch of guys flopping around in the water and relating to one another on a very friendly level.' . . .

"The topic that hung heaviest all week was Vietnam. At every chance, Belafonte leaked his strong opposition. Finally, when Dr. King appeared last Thursday, Belafonte had a chance to escalate his own frankness. 'All of us here feel very strongly on the war, and we oppose it,' he said. Who did Dr. King think should get the 1966 protest vote? Sen. Eugene McCarthy, answered Dr. King. 'Well,' said Belafonte, 'I'm going for him.' " (In 1965, Belafonte supported the New York City mayoralty candidacy of Congressman William Fitts Ryan, one of the most extreme leftists ever to sit in Congress, whose chief claim to fame was his hysterical campaign to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activites.)

Belafonte has been affiliated with the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the leftwing-pacifist Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and the leftwing-pacifist Negotiation Now! – the latter organized by Martin L. King Jr. and Joseph L. Rauh Jr. (Belafonte has been a financial angel to the Martin L. King family.)

Belafonte's racial agitation has been noticeable through his affiliation with the leftwing Congress of Racial Equality, the leftwing National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the leftwing American Committee on Africa, which – in recent years – has concentrated its fire on the internal affairs of the Republic of South Africa. Also among Belafonte's leftwing-racist affiliations has been the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (Snick). In 1966, Belafonte solicited funds for Snick by using the mailing list of the Communists' *National Guardian.*

Belafonte was close to the Kennedy Dynasty and served as a Special Advisor to President Kennedy on the Peace Corps. President Lyndon Johnson, however, fell out of Belafonte's favor. In the Communists' *Worker* of July 18, 1965, there was a report of Belafonte's appearance at a fund-raising party for the Detroit Committee to End the War in Vietnam. Said Belafonte: "Johnson seemed to care about poverty and peace, he got on TV and said we shall overcome and I felt good until I saw what he wanted to overcome – in Vietnam, as in the Congo, and later in the Dominican Republic.

"We seem to have a grand design for being in all the wrong places at the wrong time. Johnson is a sick man, I don't need him to wipe my nose. He lied, however, about what he would do. Patriotism has now a whole different meaning to me than I was taught on the battlefields in World War II. I don't understand boundaries and I don't understand flags anymore." (Belafonte's reference to his battlefield education is rather curious. During World War II, he served in the U.S. Navy as a storekeeper for eighteen months – all of which service was in the continental United States.)

In the same speech, Belafonte attacked the House Committee on Un-American Activities by explaining that the "enemy is not Communism, but those who refuse to deal on a human level because they have greed all over their faces."

DANIEL BELL was born on May 10, 1919 in New York City, son of Anna Kaplan and Benjamin Bolotsky. He was married to and divorced from Nora Potashnick and Elaine Graham. His third wife is Pearl Kazin. He is an alumnus of the City College of New York (B.S., 1939) and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1960). He is the author of *Marxian Socialism in the United States* (1952), *Work and Its Discontents* (1956), *The End of Ideology* (1960), and *The Reforming of General Education* (1966). He is editor of and contributor to *The New American Right* (1955) and its expanded and updated version, *The Radical Right* (1963). He is co-editor of and contributor to *Confrontation: The Student Rebellion and the Universities.* He is editor of *Toward the Year 2000: Work in Progress* (1968). He is a contributor to *Approaches to Education for Character* (1969). He is on the editorial board of the periodicals *Daedalus* and *The American Scholar.* Since 1965, he has been a co-editor of *The Public Interest,* a journal of Freedom House.

From 1939 until 1944, Bell was with the Socialist weekly, *New Leader,* as a staff writer (1939-41) and as managing editor (1941-44). (As an adolescent, Bell belonged to the Young People's Socialist

League and to the socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy.) In 1945, for a brief time, Bell was managing editor of the leftwing periodical *Common Sense.*

From 1945 until 1948, Bell was an instructor in sociology at the University of Chicago. From 1948 until 1958, he was the labor editor of *Fortune* magazine. While with *Fortune,* he joined the faculty at Columbia University, where he was a lecturer in sociology (1952-59), associate professor of sociology (1959-1962), and professor and chairman of the department of sociology (1962-1969). In 1966 and 1967, he was a visiting professor at the University of Chicago. In 1969, he joined the sociology faculty at Harvard University.

Bell has been an official of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy; an official of the American Civil Liberties Union, a motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness; a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; a member of Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent who promotes anti-anti-Communism; and a member of the Institute for American Democracy, an anti-anti-Communist offshoot of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. For more than fifteen years, he has been an activist leader of the Congress for Cultural Freedom, which has been subsidized in great part throughout most of its history by the Central Intelligence Agency. (In the September 1967 issue of *Commentary* magazine, Bell described the Congress as "formed by hundreds of intellectuals [of the left] . . . to rally their fellows against totalitarianism and to stand as a symbol of free inquiry and common discourse for intellectuals in all countries." He insisted that the Congress was not anti-Communist. For his own part, he said, he was opposed to Communism on moral grounds; he was not opposed to the "political" aspects of Communism *per se* but he was against its repressive measures.)

Aside from his affiliations, Bell's leftist sympathies have been quite evident in his literary works. In 1955, Bell selected as symposiasts for *The Radical Right* a truly representative collection of leftists (Nathan Glazer, Richard Hofstadter, H.H. Hyman, Seymour Lipset, Talcott Parsons, David Riesman, Peter Viereck, Alan F. Westin), who could be relied upon to vilify Joseph R. McCarthy and all other influential anti-Communists. Bell's own contribution to the symposium included a downgrading of the strength and influence of the Communist Party in the United States; harsh criticism of loyalty oaths; slurs on the so-called military-industrial complex; sympathy for J. Robert Oppenheimer, the security risk; and excoriation of McCarthyism.

In 1969, when Bell was co-editor and contributor to the symposium *Confrontation,* he and his colleagues – all of whom were leftwingers – followed the leftwing sociological line by reading profound sociological meanings into the outrages committed on the nation's campuses, rather than recognizing that revolution was being perpetrated for the sake of revolution.

In *Life* magazine ("Toward a Communal Society," May 12, 1967), Bell was given the most far-reaching forum in his experience to express his leftism. He was introduced to the readers of *Life* by its managing editor, George P. Hunt, as "the intellectuals' intellectual." Bell then proceeded to expound upon the virtues of a welfare state for the United States, with a strong centralized government, achieved in great part by the elimination of state boundaries and most local governments. In essence, and in a highly literate manner, Bell presented the typical left-liberal pessimism concerning people's ability to regulate their economic, political, and social lives. The solution he offered by strong implication was governance by enlightened planners of his own stripe.

BERNARD R. BERELSON was born on June 2, 1912 in Spokane, Washington, son of Bessie Shapiro and Max Berelson. He was married to and divorced from Elizabeth Durand and Rosalind Kean. His third wife is Ruth Palter. He is an alumnus of Whitman College (A.B., 1934), the University of Washington (B.S., 1936; M.A., 1937), and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1941). He is the author of *The Library's Public* (1949) and *Content Analysis* (1952); co-author of *What Reading Does To People* (1940), *The People's Choice* (1944), *Voting* (1954), and *Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings* (1964); co-editor of *Reader in Communication and Public Opinion* (1950); and editor of *Education for Librarianship* (1949), *Graduate Education in the United States* (1960), and *Family Planning and Population Programs* (1966) [Berelson is the father of five children]. He has contributed articles to *Collier's Encyclopedia* and *Encyclopaedia Britannica.*

From 1941 until 1944, Berelson was a special analyst with the foreign broadcast intelligence service of the Federal Communications Commission. From 1944 until 1946, he was the research director at Columbia University's bureau of applied social research. From 1946 until 1951, he was at the University of Chicago: assistant professor of library science and social sciences (1946-1947); associate professor (1947-1948); professor (1949-1951); dean of the Graduate Library School (1947-1951); and chairman of the committee on communication (1947-1951). From 1951 until 1957, he was with the ultra-leftist Ford Foundation as director of behavioral sciences. From 1957 until 1959, he was at the University of Chicago as professor of behavioral sciences and director of studies of graduate education. In 1960 and 1961, he was at Columbia University as a professor of sociology and director of the University's bureau of applied social research. Since 1961, he has been with the Population Council: director of the communication research program (1961-1963); vice president (1963-1968); and since 1968, president. [The Population Council is a favorite project of the leftwing Establishment in its drive to have the federal government assume control of family life.] Since 1964, he has been a member of the committee on population of the National Academy of Sciences.

Although Berelson is and has been in the midst of the leftwing Establishment, he has not been a compulsive joiner. However, he was affiliated with the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the Chicago Ad Hoc Committee of Welcome for the Dean of Canterbury (paying homage to England's most notorious Red clergyman); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility.

DANIEL M. BERMAN was born on June 15, 1928 in Paterson, New Jersey, son of Roselyn Pollock and Isidor Berman. He married Aline Fugh. He is an alumnus of Rutgers University (A.B., 1947; Ph.D., 1957) and the University of Wisconsin (A.M., 1948). He is the author of *A Bill Becomes a Law: The Civil Rights Act of 1960* (1962); *In Congress Assembled: The Legislative Process in the National Government* (1964); and *It Is So Ordered: The Supreme Court Rules on School Segregation* (1967).

In 1957 and 1958, Berman was an instructor at the State University of New York. From 1958 until 1961, he was an assistant professor at Washington College of Maryland. Since 1961, he has been at American University, as associate professor (1961-1964) and, since 1964, professor of government and public administration. In 1960 and 1961, he was a staff consultant to the U.S. Senate subcommittee on constitutional rights.

Berman was affiliated with the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee, which was supported by members of the Communist Party and individuals with long Communist-front records. He sponsored the Emergency Committee for Disaster Relief to Cuba, whose chairman was Communist Sidney Gluck. He sponsored Defenders of Three against HCUA – the three had been found in contempt of Congress when questioned about their involvement in a Japanese Communist's tour of the United States. He has petitioned for repeal of the McCarran Internal Security Act – repeal being a longtime objective of the Communist Party. He has long been an official of Frank Wilkinson's National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"). He has joined in left-wing-peacenik anti-Viet Nam War activities.

DANIEL BERRIGAN was born on May 9, 1921 in Virginia, Minnesota, son of Frieda Fromhart and Thomas Berrigan – a union organizer and one-time militant member of the Socialist Party.

At the age of eighteen, Berrigan entered the Society of Jesus (Jesuits). In 1952, he was ordained to the Roman Catholic priesthood. During his years in the seminary, he achieved masters' degrees in philosophy and theology. He is the author of *World for Wedding Ring; They Call Us Dead Men; No One Walks Waters; Consequences: Truth and 1967; Go From Here: A Prison Journal; Love, Love at the End; Night Flight to Hanoi; Trial Poems; The Trial of the Catonsville Nine;* and *No Bars to Manhood.*

After his ordination, Berrigan was sent by his Jesuit superiors to France, where he spent almost two years in study and ministerial work. In France, he developed a very close association with worker-priests whose radicalism in religious and political affairs caused Pope Pius XII, in 1954, to dissolve the worker-priest movement. (Of his experience in France, Berrigan said: "Arriving in France was like landing on a fresh-air planet after being locked up all my life in a capsule. The American Church [*sic*], at the time, was an Irish ghetto. I had never been politically aware before. I arrived so American, such an idiot. The worker-priests radicalized me as nothing ever had before. They gave me, for the first time, a practical vision of the Church as she should be. They also transformed me politically in a historic year. The French had just lost Dien Bien Phu and were being forced out of Indo-China, and my French friends woke me up to the evils of colonialism. To make it all the more traumatic, I saw this worker-priest movement, which I so admired, squashed before my very eyes. In

1954, our icebox pope, Pius XII, had the movement dissolved in one swift stroke. Four years before, he had issued that shameful document 'Humani Generis,' which was directed against some of the great French theologians who had nourished me for years – Teilhard de Chardin, Yves Congar, Henri de Lubac. I saw at close hand intellectual excellence crushed in a wave of orthodoxy, like a big Stalinist purge. It hit me directly, it made me suffer deeply, it filled me with determination to carry on the work of the men who had been silenced.")

Upon his return from France in 1954, Berrigan began a three-year assignment at Brooklyn Preparatory School, a Jesuit institution, where he taught theology and French. Off campus, during this period, he became involved with the leftwing-pacifist Catholic Worker Movement and the Young Christian Workers. With the latter group, he became a do-gooder in the Negro and Puerto Rican communities of East Harlem. And, at the same time, he was an activist in the Walter Ferrell Guild, a group which had as its primary objective a more authoritative participation by the laity in the affairs of the Catholic Church.

From 1957, Berrigan was on the faculty of Le Moyne College in Syracuse, New York. In the Syracuse area, he was an active racial agitator and a liturgical reformer. On campus and off campus, his exhibitionism made him so controversial a figure that his Jesuit superiors terminated his work at Le Moyne in 1963, when he was sent to France on sabbatical leave. Of the circumstances surrounding Berrigan's sabbatical year, James Forest, a friend, said: "The Daniel Berrigan of 1962 was an earnest, chubby, well-fed man who looked just like a priest: all neat and clean, with very shiny shoes and an impeccably clean collar . . . . I didn't meet Dan again until the summer of 1964, when I flew to Paris for a Christian Peace Conference with some mutual friends of Dan's. He'd spent the year in Paris, and he was at the airport to meet us. I almost passed him by. I did not recognize him at first. The man standing at the airport was dressed in a turtleneck and a green ski jacket and had a satchel full of wine bottles strung over his shoulder. That chubby face of his had turned gaunt, yet incredibly serene. He had become ascetic, spiritual, unpriestly! It was a totally new vibration. He had finally become deparochialized." (Quoted in Francine Gray's "Acts of Witness," *New Yorker,* March 14, 1970.)

Miss Gray added a further dimension to Berrigan's experience: "Daniel was also transformed that year by some trips he made to Communist countries. He was one of the first American priests to be granted visas to Hungary, Russia, and Czecho-Slovakia, and his excursions to these places shook him. Behind the Iron Curtain, he met families, Protestant as well as Catholic, whose jobs, schooling, and income were constantly jeopardized by their religious practices, and he was deeply affected by the courage of those Christians." For his own part, Berrigan observed: "The churches in the Marxist countries are small but purified by persecution. It seems that God is cleaning up the old church-state arrangements. The Christians under Marxism have returned to their pre-Constantinian situation of being poor, pure, and persecuted, and they are leading the life which I believe God had decreed for the Church. What a great feeling, to be in a country where there's no head of state going to church every Sunday and corrupting it!"

When Berrigan returned from

Europe, he became an overnight hero to ultra-leftwing pacifists. In 1965, he was a co-founder of the Catholic Peace Fellowship, which specialized in the encouragement of Catholic youths to become conscientious objectors. (In the Fellowship with Berrigan were his brother Philip, a Josephite priest; Thomas Merton, the celebrated Trappist priest and long-time pacifist; and Dorothy Day, whose career in red radicalism spans more than five decades.)

In 1965, Berrigan became a co-founder of Clergy Concerned about Vietnam (later named Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam). In this enterprise, he was associated with some of the nation's most notorious leftwing clergy, including: Abraham Heschel, Richard Neuhaus, John C. Bennett, James Matthews, Eugene Carson Blake, Martin L. King Jr., Harvey Cox, Dana McLean Greeley, Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert McAfee Brown, and William Sloane Coffin Jr.

Berrigan was not merely a letterhead figure in the leftwing-pacifist movement. He was a familiar figure at lectures, teach-ins, and sit-ins, where he inveighed against the Vietnam War. He cultivated a friendship with the Kennedy brothers, Robert and Edward, and their brother-in-law, Sargent Shriver. He took part in the original major demonstrations in opposition to Lyndon Johnson's retaliatory bombing policy against North Vietnam. At one of those demonstrations where Berrigan shared the platform with the veteran leftwing pacifists David Dellinger and Abraham J. Muste, he said: "To wage war in modern times as war is being waged in Vietnam is forbidden . . . . In such war, man stands outside the blessing of God. He stands, in fact, under His curse." (On another occasion, Berrigan joined in a "Declaration of Conscience," sponsored by the *Catholic Worker*, the Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Student Peace Union, and the War Resisters League – all leftwing-pacifist. The Declaration said: "We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development.")

In 1965, Berrigan's base of operations was an associate editorship of *Jesuit Missions,* an ultra-liberal monthly which served as an outlet for his leftwing-pacifism and a newly-awakened interest in civil rights agitation. At the same time, Berrigan was also becoming an embarrassment to ecclesiastical authorities because of his advocacy and practice of unorthodox liturgical reforms.

In November 1965, under pressure from the hierarchy of the Archdiocese of New York, Berrigan was sent by his Jesuit superiors to Latin America on a reporting assignment for *Jesuit Missions.* The assignment was recognized by Berrigan's followers in leftwing circles as a punitive exile. Pro-Berrigan pickets demonstrated at the Catholic campuses of Le Moyne College and Marquette, Fordham, and St. John's Universities. A "Committee for Daniel Berrigan" placed a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times,* as hundreds of priests, nuns, seminarians, and laymen protested Berrigan's exile and demanded that he be brought back to the United States.

While in Latin America, Berrigan sought out and met with leftwing sympathizers and his writings reflected a leftwinger's view of the political, economic, and social scene. He saw "the scandal of this incessant misery of millions perpetuated by American investments which are to the tune of billions, the scandal of our missionary policy which supports a reactionary church standing in the way of human progress." And, it became quite obvious that he favored the social and political revolutionary efforts of the extreme left in every one of the ten Latin American countries he visited.

In March 1966, Berrigan returned from his Latin American journey and in New York City, with the fanfare of a press conference, he announced that he would carry on his militant pacifism more vigorously than before. He continued his work at *Jesuit Missions* until the fall of 1967 when he was assigned to Cornell University, where he joined the theology faculty, served as a chaplain, and became an associate director of the Cornell United Religious Work. While at Cornell, he continued his pacifist activities and he found many sympathizers among the students and faculty. He continued his membership in the Catholic Peace Fellowship and, along the way, he joined other anti-war groups such as Individuals against the Crime of Silence and the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. He associated with Black Panthers and other revolutionaries. And, most important, his position at Cornell allowed him to be reunited with his brother Philip, who was also achieving heroic stature among extreme radical civil rights and pacifist groups.

In October 1967, Berrigan was arrested during the course of an anti-war demonstration at the Pentagon. Three months later, he went to Hanoi with Howard Zinn to secure the release of several American prisoners-of-war. (Leaders of the extreme left had found it fashionable by that time to undertake propaganda missions to North Vietnam as a dramatic and well-publicized defiance of the United States government. Of his own mission, Berrigan wrote: "We had huddled with the 'enemy' in subterranean Hanoi barrows while iron American fists punished the face of the city. We had walked through the evidence of American air atrocities in the Civil Defense Museum, with its eerie bottles of human organs cut to ribbons by improved anti-personnel weaponry dumped day after day on the city." ["The New Man: The Compleat Soldier," *Saturday Review*, February 14, 1970.] Berrigan's concern for the alleged victims of American atrocities in Hanoi has not been balanced by any condemnation of the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong for their thoroughly documented atrocities committed against Americans and South Vietnamese.)

On May 17, 1968, Berrigan was one of what became known as The Catonsville Nine. (The Nine included Philip Berrigan; Thomas Melville, a former Maryknoll priest, and his wife, Marjorie, a former Maryknoll nun; John Hogan, a former Maryknoll brother; David Darst, a Christian Brother; Thomas Lewis, an artist and art teacher; Mary Moylan, a registered nurse; and George Mische, formerly with the Alliance for Progress and a professional "peace" agitator.) The Nine invaded the Selective Service office in Catonsville, Maryland, where they set fire with napalm to draft records. Eventually, they were tried in a federal district court and found guilty on charges of conspiracy and destroying government property. (Berrigan celebrated the affair with two books: *The Trial of the Catonsville Nine* and *Trial Poems.*)

For his part in the Catonsville incident, Berrigan was sentenced to three years' imprisonment. However, he was not yet ready for martyrdom in the cause of pacifism and he appealed his conviction to the Supreme Court of the United States. In February 1970, the Supreme Court rejected his appeal. On April 9, 1970, he was scheduled to begin his prison sentence but Berrigan did not surrender himself to the authorities and, instead, chose to become a fugitive from justice.

In his first hours as a fugitive, Berrigan wrote an open letter to his Jesuit colleagues: "Two years after Catonsville, the arguments we proposed against the slaughter go unheeded. Our Government widens the swath of death in Southeast Asia . . . . It is now officially forbidden under threat of heavy penalty to initiate public debate on the issues which our acts have striven to raise. We are gagged in public and in the courts. And a war, undeclared and in despite of every humane and constitutional law, goes on like a runaway nightmare. In the face of such events, the courts have become more and more the instruments of the warmakers. Can Christians, therefore, unthinkingly submit before such powers? We judge not. The powers and dominations remain subject to Christ, our consciences are in his keeping and no other. To act as though we were criminals before God or humanity, to cease resisting a war which has immeasurably widened since we first acted, to retire meekly to silence and isolation – this seems to Philip [his brother, who was also, at the time, a fugitive] and me a betrayal of our ministry."

During the early weeks of his fugitive status, Berrigan granted several interviews to Philip Nobile, a staff member of *Commonweal* magazine and the *National Catholic Reporter.* Writing in the *New York Times Magazine* ("The Priest Who Stayed Out in the Cold"), Nobile reported that Berrigan was hiding somewhere in the Boston-Washington corridor. During the course of one interview, Berrigan explained to Nobile why he fled to the underground: "Before Catonsville it was important to consider breaking human law for the sake of peace and decency. Now we are saying it is important deliberately to reject punishment for this lawbreaking . . . . We reject the automatic continuum between crime and punishment, that a good man to prove he is a good man must accept his punishment. This acquiescence may be politically irresponsible because by capitulating you may strengthen the forces of evil you first confronted in your action." (Berrigan's disdain for the law was also revealed in another underground interview he granted to Bob Fitch of *Christian Century.* Fitch wrote [May 20, 1970] that when he asked Berrigan why he refused to surrender for his imprisonment, the reply was: "If we think the law is unjust and don't cooperate with it, then we have no reason to cooperate with what we believe is an unjust punishment." Berrigan's logic as a fugitive contrasted sharply with the bravado of his remarks at the conclusion of the Catonsville trial, when he said: "I would like to thank the court and the prosecution. I think we agree that this was the greatest day of our lives.")

On August 11, 1970, Berrigan was apprehended at Block Island, Rhode Island, in the home of lawyer William Stringfellow and poet Anthony Towne. The arrest was made by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Berrigan was committed to the federal prison at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, where he began serving his three-and-a-half-year sentence.

PHILIP F. BERRIGAN was born on October 5, 1923 in Two Harbors, Minnesota, son of Frieda Fromhart and Thomas Berrigan – a union organizer and one-time militant member of the Socialist Party. He attended St. Michael's College (Toronto) for one semester. In 1943, he was drafted into the U.S. Army. He served in the European theater during World War II and, in 1946, he left the army as a second lieutenant in the infantry. He is an alumnus of Holy Cross College (A.B., 1950), Loyola University of New Orleans (B.S., 1960), and Xavier University of New Orleans (M.A., 1963). He is the author of *No More Strangers.* He has contributed articles to *Commonweal, Catholic Worker, Interracial Review,* and *Jubilee.*

In 1950, Berrigan entered the seminary of St. Joseph's Society of the Sacred Heart. (The Josephites are a rather small order of Roman Catholic priests who work almost exclusively among Negroes.) In 1955, he was ordained a priest, and during the next year he served as an assistant pastor in Washington, D.C.

From 1956 until 1963, Berrigan was a teacher and counsellor at an all-Negro high school in New Orleans, where his racial agitation made him a controversial figure in the community. (Francine Gray, writing in the *New Yorker* of March 14, 1970 ["Acts of Witness"], said of Berrigan: "Philip concluded with sorrow, after joining the only Catholic order dedicated primarily to the task of improving the lot of the black man, that the Society of St. Joseph was far too timid in its approach. For in his view the blacks are not children to be guided by the whites; they are, rather, the race of superior wisdom, gentleness, and maturity – the prophetic people, purified and matured by suffering, who could bring adulthood to the white man. In his book, *No More Strangers,* a formidably documented work, published in 1965, on the psychological roots of racism, he wrote, 'The Negro stands in perplexity and chagrin at the inconsistency of the white man-child who rules his world . . . . Freedom for the Negro and maturity for us are reciprocal endowments.' "

Miss Gray also remarked of Berrigan: "A profound reverence for the black race and a deep contempt for paternalism have made Philip capable of communicating with militant blacks as few white priests can. 'He never made a fuss with us because we were black,' one of his parishioners has said. 'He was just more at ease with us than any white man we'd ever met.' Stokely Carmichael reportedly paid him the ultimate compliment, by saying, 'Phil Berrigan is the *only* white man who knows where it's at.' ")

In 1963, Berrigan was transferred from New Orleans to the Josephites' Epiphany Apostolic College in New Windsor, New York. During the next two years, he served as director of promotion for the Josephites and as an English instructor.

Shortly after Berrigan took his position at New Windsor, he attracted widespread publicity in connection with a racial sit-in demonstration in Jackson, Mississippi. He set out from New York, determined to be the first Catholic priest arrested in such a demonstration. Only the intervention of Josephite authorities foiled his plans, but the press portrayed him in an heroic role and he became a national celebrity.

Civil rights agitation and leftwing pacifism shared equally in the expenditure of Berrigan's energies. He joined the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Urban League, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the Catholic Peace Fellowship. He joined in demonstrations with members of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He lectured at various campuses on the evils of war, especially the Vietnam War, which he characterized as a civil war in which the United States had a morally untenable position as an aggressor punishing a "popular uprising." (In one of his typical diatribes against the Vietnam War, Berrigan said: "The Christian Church [*sic*] has been one of the staunchest allies of nationalism and the natural armor of weaponry and militarism that nationalism demands; of the imperception and witch-hunting relative to Communism; of the trivia and baubles of American bourgeois living. The American Church [*sic*], in regard to Vietnam, has already reached the measure of default of the German Church [*sic*] under Hitler, and a position far less defensible, since in speaking of the immorality of Hitler's aggressive wars the German Church [*sic*] had to confront a totalitarian regime, and we do not." On another occasion, Berrigan signed a "Declaration of Conscience," sponsored by the *Catholic Worker*, the Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Student Peace Union, and the War Resisters League – all leftwing-pacifist. The Declaration said: "We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development.")

In Newburgh, New York – nearby to New Windsor – Berrigan became a trouble-rouser on two fronts. With a group of Josephite seminarians, he organized a community center which served as a base for creating and increasing racial unrest within the city. He also established a leftwing-pacifist Emergency Citizens' Group Concerned about Vietnam, analogous to his brother Daniel's Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam, a group which was and remains in the vanguard of those who encourage resistance to the selective service act. (Daniel Berrigan, a Jesuit priest, although two years older than Philip, was a willing follower of his brother along the revolutionary trail of leftwing pacifism and civil rights agitation. Separately and together, the brothers became familiar figures at sit-ins, teach-ins, and anti-Vietnam War demonstrations.)

In 1965, Philip Berrigan's off-campus activities became so notorious that his Josephite superiors ordered an end to his anti-Vietnam War speeches and he was told to relinquish his leadership of the Emergency Citizens' Group Concerned about Vietnam. The proscription had been effective for only a few days before Berrigan publicly lashed out at United States participation in the Vietnam War as the predictable action of a racist government and people: "Do you honestly expect that we could so abuse our own Negro citizens for three hundred and forty years, so resist their moral and democratic rights, so mistreat, exploit, starve, terrorize, rape, and murder them without all this showing itself in foreign policy? Is it possible for us to be vicious, brutal, immoral, and violent at home and be fair, judicious, beneficent, and idealistic abroad?"

Berrigan's defiance of his superiors' disciplinary efforts brought about his transfer to a curacy in a Baltimore parish, St. Peter Claver, with a congregation that was predominantly Negro.

The move to Baltimore did not retard Berrigan's activities. He organized a community center which served as a headquarters for a widespread campaign of racial agitation. He continued to fulminate against the Vietnam War with his insistence that Negroes, at home and in Vietnam, were carrying the major burden of the war as servicemen or victims of poverty. He was particularly vituperative against Catholics, laity and clergy, who opted for victory in Vietnam against the Communist aggressors: "Our support of the Saigon government, which is, in reality, no government; our indiscriminate attacks with bombs and napalm against innocent peasants in the hope of killing a few Vietcong; our bombing of industry and transportation in a nation against whom we have no cause for grievance, and against whom we have not declared war; our testing of inhumane weapons and the increasing troop commitment to a combat role; the whole rising tide of savagery and ruin which we have provoked and which we now sustain – these not only contradict the Gospel and make fidelity to it a mockery, they also reject, out of hand, the [Catholic] theory of the Just War."

At St. Peter Claver's Church, Berrigan held meetings of a newly organized group, the Baltimore Inter-faith Peace Mission, composed of laity and clergy who were pacifists and/or civil rights agitators. The efforts of the Mission were devoted almost exclusively to anti-Vietnam War demonstrations in Washington, D.C., and at Fort Myer, Virginia. The theme of the demonstrations included demands for a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam and inclusion of the National Liberation Front in peace negotiations.

Berrigan's peaceniks picketed the homes of Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. They held prayer vigils. On one occasion, Secretary Rusk met for almost two hours with Berrigan and two of his colleagues for an unproductive exchange of views. But the most dramatic and widely publicized demonstrations were held at Fort Myer, where Berrigan and other clergymen sought in vain to be arrested by the military authorities.

In October 1967, the Baltimore Inter-faith Peace Mission participated in the riotous demonstrations at the Pentagon, where several thousand peaceniks tried to force their way into the building but were beaten back by United States marshals, paratroopers, and National Guardsmen. Berrigan was dejected by the results of the Pentagon fiasco and he decided to dramatize his cause in a more effective manner.

On October 27, 1967, Berrigan and three companions (Thomas Lewis, an artist and art teacher; James Mengel, a minister of the United Church of Christ; and David Eberhardt, a poet) invaded the selective service office at the Customs House in Baltimore. Eight members of the press had been alerted to the action and each was given a sealed envelope containing a statement drafted by Berrigan and Mengel: "We are entering the Customs House in Baltimore, Maryland, to deface the draft records there with our blood. We shed our blood willingly and gratefully in what we hope is a sacrificial and constructive act. We pour it on these files to illustrate that with them and with these offices begins the pitiful waste of American and Vietnamese blood ten thousand miles away. We implore our countrymen to judge our action against this nation's Judeo-Christian tradition against the horror in Vietnam and the impending threat of nuclear destruction. We invite our friends in the peace and freedom movements to continue moving with us from dissent to resistance . . . . We ask God to be merciful and patient with all men." (The statement was not completely accurate. Most of the blood used was Berrigan's. The remainder was duck's blood, purchased from a delicatessen, and squeezings from some calves' liver. Berrigan's three companions proved to be very reluctant blood donors even for the "sacrificial and constructive act.")

The four men lied their way into the selective service office. Berrigan, with photographers standing by, poured the accumulation of blood over several drawers of files. Then the four awaited arrest by agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In November, they were indicted by a grand jury on charges of mutilating and destroying government property and hindering selective service procedures. In April 1967, after pleading innocent, they were convicted on all charges. In May 1968, Berrigan and Lewis were sentenced to six years' imprisonment, Eberhardt to three years, and Mengel's sentence was deferred. On the following day, Josephite superiors ended Berrigan's curacy at St. Peter Claver's Parish.

On May 17, 1968, a week before receiving his six-year sentence, Berrigan was one of what became known as The Catonsville Nine. (The Nine included Daniel Berrigan; Thomas Melville, a former Maryknoll priest, and his wife, Marjorie, a former Maryknoll nun; John Hogan, a former Maryknoll brother; David Darst, a Christian Brother; Mary Moylan, a registered nurse; George Mische, formerly with the Alliance for Progress and a professional "peace" agitator; and Thomas Lewis, a veteran of the Baltimore Customs House affair.)

After the destruction of the selective service records in Baltimore, Berrigan had become quite discouraged because his actions had not generated widespread sympathy for his cause. He spent months recruiting the Catonsville Nine for an even more symbolic action at the selective service office in Catonsville, Maryland. As he had done at Baltimore, he forewarned members of the press and gave them sealed envelopes containing his plans: "Today, May 17th, we enter Local Board No. 33 at Catonsville, Maryland, to seize Selective Service records and burn them with napalm . . . . We destroy these draft records not only because they exploit our young men but because they represent misplaced power concentrated in the ruling class of America . . . . We confront the Catholic Church, other Christian bodies, and the synagogues of America with their silence and cowardice in face of our country's crimes . . . . Now this injustice must be faced, and this we intend to do, with whatever strength of mind, body, and grace that God will give us. May God have mercy on our nation."

As was described in the statement given to the press, the Nine invaded the Catonsville selective service office and set fire with napalm to draft records. Eventually, they were tried in a federal district court and found guilty on charges of conspiracy and destroying government property. Berrigan was sentenced to three and a half years' imprisonment to be served concurrently with the six-year sentence he received for the Baltimore escapade.

Berrigan appealed his conviction to

the Supreme Court of the United States. In February 1970, the Supreme Court rejected his appeal. On April 9, 1970, he was scheduled to begin his prison sentence, but Berrigan did not surrender himself to the authorities and, instead, chose to become a fugitive from justice, as did his brother Daniel, Mary Moylan, George Mische, and David Eberhardt.

Berrigan's status as a fugitive lasted twelve days. On April 21, he and Eberhardt were found by FBI agents hiding in a closet at St. Gregory the Great's Church in New York City. A federal district judge in New York City ordered their immediate return to Baltimore, where they began serving their sentences.

HERBERT J. BIBERMAN was born on March 4, 1900 in Philadelphia, son of Eva Goldich and Joseph Biberman. He married Gale Sondergaard. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (B.S., 1921). In 1927, he received a Certificate in Fine Arts from Yale University. In 1928, he made a tour of Europe to study theatre production. From 1929 until 1933, he was associated with the New York Theatre Guild as an assistant stage manager and production stage manager.

In 1935, Biberman entered the motion picture industry, wherein he has been a writer, director, and associate producer. While employed by many of the major studios in Hollywood, he was one of the most active leftwingers in the entertainment industry.

Biberman's affiliations have included the California Labor School ("a subversive and Communist organization"); Consumers Union ("subversive and un-American"); the Jewish People's Committee ("subversive and Communist"); Associated Film Audiences ("Communist front"), which merged with Films for Democracy ("Communist front") to form Film Audiences for Democracy ("Communist front"); People's Educational Center ("a Communist Party school"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); the American Peace Crusade ("Communist front"); American Peace Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist and subversive" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the American Committee to Save Refugees ("Communist enterprise"); the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("Communist"); the Motion Picture Artists' Committee ("Communist front"); the First Congress of the Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples of the United States ("Communist front"); the Hollywood Anti-Nazi League ("Communist front"); the Motion Picture Democratic Committee ("Communist front"); the Hollywood League for Democratic Action ("Communist front"); the Hollywood Democratic Committee ("Communist front"); Progressive Citizens of America ("Communist front"); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the California Conference for Democratic Action ("Communist front"); the International Workers Order ("subversive and Communist"); the League of American Writers ("subversive and Communist"); the New Theatre League ("Communist front"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere");

the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims ("subversive"); and the American League against War and Fascism ("subversive and Communist").

On October 29, 1947, Biberman testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He told the Committee his name, address, birthdate, and birthplace, but on all other matters he refused to be cooperative. Biberman was succeeded on the witness stand by Louis J. Russell, an investigator for the HCUA. Russell testified that he had discovered that in 1944, Biberman was a card-carrying member of the Communist Party. Biberman, who had refused to affirm or deny membership in the Communist Party, was cited for contempt of Congress by the House of Representatives. After his conviction on contempt charges, Biberman served a six-month sentence in the Federal Correctional Institution at Texarkana, Texas.

In 1950, upon his release from prison, Biberman formed the Independent Productions Corporation with Simon Lazarus and Paul Jarrico, both of whom pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment when questioned before HCUA as to their membership in the Communist Party.

The sole business of Independent Productions Corporation was to make *Salt of the Earth,* a motion picture which glorified a strike by the International Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers – a union which had been expelled from the CIO for being controlled by Communists. Paul Jarrico was the producer of *Salt of the Earth;* Biberman was the director; Michael Wilson, Jarrico's brother-in-law, was the script writer; and in the cast were Gale Sondergaard, Biberman's wife, and Will Geer – all of whom pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment when questioned as to their membership in the Communist Party.

Wilson's script for *Salt of the Earth* was a simple presentation of the Communist line on racism and capitalism, and the Communist nature of the film caused Biberman and his associates many difficulties before they could process and exhibit it. (Anita Bell Schneider, who worked within the Communist Party for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, testified before the HCUA that Biberman solicited help from the Communist Party to finance *Salt of the Earth* and that the Communists organized a film club to promote showings for the production. Simon Lazarus, the president of Independent Productions Corporation, pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment when the HCUA asked him whether the Communist Party had financed *Salt of the Earth.*)

Biberman did manage to have *Salt of the Earth* exhibited in Europe, where the film received awards from the Motion Picture Academy of France and the Karlovy Vary Film Festival of Czecho-Slovakia. In the United States, however, the showings of the film were restricted to small avant-garde movie houses.

In 1965, Beacon Press published Biberman's *Salt of the Earth,* an account of his life during the years 1947-1965, during which, he says, he was "subject to the blacklist by the motion picture industry because of his refusal to cooperate with the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of his participation in the independent production of the film, *Salt of the Earth,* and of its suffocation in the market; of an anti-trust suit against the industry, of the subsequent trial. Since the past seventeen years have been spent largely in battling the blacklist – this book represents ten of those years in the wake of the aborted effort to achieve independency." (In fact, Biberman's book is an arrogant venture in distortion. He implies that he was persecuted by the HCUA because he is a Jew, an absolutely baseless canard. On the other hand, he makes no mention of his history as one of the most active and persistent recruiters for Communist fronts in the entire motion-picture industry.)

From 1956 until 1963, Biberman was president of Mangaard, Inc., a firm of land developers in New York. In 1968, he returned to the motion-picture industry as the script writer and director of *Slaves.* (In the cast of *Slaves* were Biberman's wife, Gale Sondergaard, and Ossie Davis, whose affiliations with Communist fronts are almost as extensive as Biberman's).

Biberman's return to motion pictures was neither an artistic nor a financial success. Despite a large publicity campaign (including a by-line article by Biberman in the Sunday *New York Times* of January 19, 1969, wherein his inclination toward racial agitation was in great evidence as he both opened and invented old wounds in the history of American slavery) and exhibition in major movie houses, *Slaves* was received coldly by critics and the general public. *Newsweek's* movie reviewer wrote: "The subject [slavery] is powerful enough to survive almost any maltreatment, even at the hands of sentimental social unrealists. But *Slaves* is still trash. The cast is enslaved by the script [Biberman's], the director [Biberman] by his penchant for pseudo-artistic sadness and demi-poetic poses."

BARRY BINGHAM was born on February 10, 1906 in Louisville, Kentucky, son of Eleanor Miller and Robert Bingham. He married Mary Caperton. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1928).

Since 1930, Bingham has been with the *Louisville Courier-Journal* and *Louisville Times*: reporter (1930-1932); secretary (1932-1935); associate publisher (1935-1937); publisher (1937-1945); and since 1945, president and editor. He has been chairman, and a member of the executive board, of the International Press Institute. He has been chairman and a member of the advisory board of the American Press Institute. In the Truman Administration, he served for two years as chief of the foreign aid mission to France in the Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1956, he was national chairman in the presidential campaign of Volunteers for Stevenson-Kefauver. He is a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, a center of power in the Liberal Establishment.

Bingham was a founder of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. He has been affiliated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead of Negro agitation for more than half a century. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, a short-lived campaign weapon for the Democrat Party, aiming principally at anti-Communists. His other affiliations have included the Council of Young Southerners ("Communist front"); the League of Young Southerners ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax ("Communist front"); and the Southern Conference for Human Welfare ("Communist front"). His newspapers have followed an editorial line similar to such leftist journals as the *Washington Post* and *New York Times.*

SARAH GIBSON BLANDING was born on November 22, 1898 in Lexington, Kentucky, daughter of Sarah Anderson and William Blanding. She is an alumna of the New Haven Normal School of Gymnastics (Certificate, 1919); the University of Kentucky (A.B., 1923); and Columbia University (M.A., 1926). She also studied at the London School of Economics in 1928 and 1929.

From 1919 until 1941, Sarah Blanding was on the faculty at the University of Kentucky: instructor of physical education (1919-1923); acting dean of women (1923-1924); assistant professor of political science (1926-1937); associate professor of political science (1937-1941); and dean of women (1926-1941). In 1941 and 1942, she was the director, and from 1942 until 1946, the dean of the New York State College of Home Economics at Cornell University. From 1946 until 1964, she was president of Vassar College, and since 1964, she has been president emeritus.

Sarah Blanding has been an official of the leftwing American Association of University Women; a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, a semi-official Fabian Socialist group whose influence upon the nation's economic policies has transcended changes in presidential administrations; an official of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness; a member of the leftwing-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States; a member of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions, a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups; a member of Freedom House's Bookshelf Committee, a collection of ultra-leftists from the literary and academic worlds; a director of the leftist Fund for Adult Education; and a member of the Committee of 100 in support of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People's legal and educational fund, a leading force in racial agitation.

[THOMAS] HALE BOGGS was born on February 15, 1914 in Long Beach, Mississippi, son of Claire Hale and William Boggs. He married Corinne Claiborne. He is an alumnus of Tulane University (B.A., 1935; LL.B., 1937), where he was a leading campus radical affiliated with the American Student Union, a Communist front.

From 1937 until 1941, Boggs practiced law in New Orleans. From 1941 until 1943, he was in the U.S. House of Representatives as a Democrat from Louisiana. In 1942, he was unsuccessful in his bid for re-nomination. He resumed his law practice but, in 1943, he was commissioned as an ensign in the U.S. Naval Reserve, and for the next three years was attached to the Potomac River Naval Command and the U.S. Maritime Service.

Since 1947, Boggs has been in the House of Representatives. Since 1961, he has been the Democratic whip in the House. Since 1954, he has been vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee. In 1964, he was parliamentarian for the Democratic National Convention, and in 1968, was chairman of the Convention's platform committee. (In 1963 and 1964, he was a member of the Warren Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy, which produced such a dubious report on that tragedy.) Throughout his years in the Congress, Boggs has been one of the most loyal hacks of the Democratic Party. In his voting record, he was faithful to the liberal leadership of

House Speaker Sam Rayburn. He was an early supporter of John F. Kennedy's presidential aspirations and served the New Frontier with devotion in the Congress. When Lyndon Johnson assumed the Presidency, Boggs joined the Great Society advocates with enthusiasm. Few Southern congressmen of the past two decades have had a higher voting record for pro-labor and pro-Americans for Democratic Action legislation than Boggs. (His only major defection in those years was in the area of civil rights, where he voted in the traditional Southern manner; however, he broke away from his Southern colleagues in 1965.)

Boggs has talked a very strong anti-Communism line over the years, but he has remained an internationalist, supporting liberal-left programs in foreign affairs during every administration back to Harry S. Truman. On the domestic front, he is a statist, supporting federal intrusion into education, medicine, welfare, wage levels, mass transportation, housing, and gun controls.

In the press, Boggs is frequently described as a mediator and compromiser, but in truth, his efforts along such lines are merely attempts to settle differences between liberals as to the amount of statism or internationalism that can be incorporated into legislation.

CHARLES G. BOLTE was born on January 19, 1920 in New York City, son of Marian Stewart and Guy Bolte. He married Mary Elwell. He is an alumnus of Dartmouth College (A.B., 1941). He is the author of *The New Veteran* (1945) and *The Price of Peace: A Plan for Disarmament* (1956).

Between his graduation from Dartmouth and the summer of 1943, Bolte saw service in the British Army. Upon his return to the United States in 1943, he plunged into a career of leftism. In 1943 and 1944, he was a special writer for Elmer Davis' Red-lined Office of War Information, and in 1944, he was a military correspondent for the ultra-radical *Nation* magazine. Meanwhile, in 1943, he organized the American Veterans Committee. (The AVC never proved to be a serious rival to the other veterans' groups, the VFW, Amvets, or the American Legion. After more than twenty-five years in operation, its membership is less than 30,000, but it has been a vocal leftwing pressure group to the extent that its program resembles a cross between Americans for Democratic Action and the American Civil Liberties Union. The National Advisory Council of the AVC has included such stellar leftists as Clark Eichelberger, Abe Fortas, Orville Freeman, Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn, Joseph L. Rauh Jr., James Roosevelt, Telford Taylor, G. Mennen Williams, and Adam Yarmolinsky; Senators Jacob Javits, Claiborne Pell, Harrison Williams, Ralph Yarborough, and Stephen Young; and Congressmen Jonathan Bingham, Donald Fraser, Richard Ottinger, Henry Reuss, and William Fitts Ryan.)

After serving as national chairman of AVC from 1944 until 1947, Bolte went to Oxford University as a Rhodes scholar and received a bachelor of letters degree in 1949. (Meanwhile, in 1947, he helped to organize United World Federalists, which soon became one of the nation's largest leftwing, one-world groups.)

When Bolte returned in 1949 to the United States after his Oxford days, he began a three-year career as a member of the U.S. mission to the United Nations.

From 1952 until 1956, he was executive secretary of the American Book Publishers Council. From 1956 until 1966, he was with Viking Press as vice president (1956-1961) and executive vice president (1961-1966). Since 1966, he has been vice president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, which has long labored to subvert America's national interests in favor of a collectivist one-world. (In 1968, at the behest of Joseph E. Johnson, president of the Carnegie Endowment, Bolte signed a letter to President Lyndon Johnson urging him to refrain from aggression in Vietnam and to consider working with the National Liberation Front politically as the lesser of evils.) Bolte is also a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

JULIAN BOND was born on January 14, 1940 in Nashville, Tennessee, son of Julia Washington and Horace Bond. He married Alice Clapton. He attended but did not graduate from Morehouse College.

In 1960, Bond began a career as a racial agitator when he participated in an Atlanta sit-in. Out of that experience, he co-founded the Committee on Appeal for Human Rights, which soon merged with the racist and revolutionary Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (Snick), a creation of Martin L. King Jr. From 1961 until 1966, Bond was on the payroll of Snick as its communications director. During the same period, he spent a few years in the employ of the *Atlanta Inquirer* as a reporter and managing editor.

In November 1965, Bond won an election to Georgia's House of Representatives. On January 10, 1966, members of the House voted (184-12) to deny him his seat. (They objected to Bond's endorsement of a Snick statement describing U.S. participation in the Vietnam War as aggression and urging young Americans to avoid the draft.) On February 10, 1966, a three-judge federal district court heard an appeal from Bond and upheld the Georgia House's decision to deny him his seat. On February 23, 1966, Bond won a special election to the same House seat, but the legislature had adjourned. In May 1966, the House Rules Committee, acting for the full House, voted unanimously against seating Bond. In June 1966, the Supreme Court of the United States agreed to hear Bond's case.

When Bond was denied his seat in Georgia's House, he became a hero to the far left. The Communists' *Worker* gave him its enthusiastic editorial support. Martin L. King Jr. organized a march upon Georgia's capitol in Atlanta. At the United Nations, delegates from fifteen African nations held a luncheon to honor Bond. Guests at the luncheon included such notorious racist agitators as Martin L. King Jr., James Forman, Bayard Rustin, and Harry Belafonte. A Citizens Committee for Julian Bond was formed. It had the usual lineup of leftist luminaries, including Martin L. King Jr., Carey McWilliams, Sidney Poitier, A. Philip Randolph, Bayard Rustin, Benjamin Spock, Ben Shahn, Norman Thomas, Dagmar Wilson, Michael Harrington, Ossie Davis, Ruby Dee, and twenty-four members from the far left wing of the Democratic Party in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Meanwhile, Bond was making points on the Left. He travelled to New York where he campaigned for leftist Paul O'Dwyer, who was seeking nomination to the U.S. Senate. Before a group of young leftists in New York, Bond issued a call for "an organized movement of Negroes to avoid military service on racial grounds. We're first class citizens on the battlefield but second class citizens at home. Why fight for a country that has never fought for you?"

In 1966, Bond participated in the Communists' *National Guardian* forum on politics and policy. He became co-chairman of the National Conference for New Politics, a classical united front third party movement largely controlled by the Communist Party. (Communist Joseph North, writing in the *Worker*, said: "When I came across Julian Bond's name as co-chairman of the National Conference for New Politics, I rejoiced.")

In 1966, Bond joined the Voters' Pledge Campaign, which was designed to support "peace" candidates who would work for a cease-fire in Vietnam and encourage negotiations in which the Vietcong would be participants. (Since 1966, Bond has touched many leftist bases. He is a board member of the Southern Conference Education Fund, the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Fund, the Martin L. King Memorial Fund, and the Highlander Research and Education Center. He is a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and Ralph Abernathy's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. In 1969, he joined the Committee to Defend the Conspiracy, on behalf of the notorious "Chicago Eight," five of whom were convicted of violating the anti-riot provision of the 1968 Civil Rights Act by crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. Bond even testified on behalf of the defendants in the "Conspiracy" trial.)

In November 1966, Bond was again elected to Georgia's House of Representatives; and in December 1966, the Supreme Court of the United States, led by Earl Warren and prompted by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, decided that Bond should never have been denied his place in the House. It was the first time any United States court had ever ruled that a state legislature did not have the right to set qualifications for its own members.

The decision of the Supreme Court made Bond one of the nation's most famous state legislators. In March 1967, the Southern Conference Education Fund held a dinner in honor of Bond. (The SCEF was the successor to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which had been a very active Communist front. Bond became a member of the board of SCEF.)

By April 1967, Bond had joined David Dellinger's Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam. At a massive Mobe demonstration in San Francisco's Kezar Stadium, he was a featured participant, together with such leftist luminaries as Coretta King, Robert Vaughn, and Eldridge Cleaver.

In June 1967, Bond granted an interview to the Communists' *Worker*. He suggested that a 1968 presidential ticket should be composed of Martin L. King Jr. and Benjamin Spock. He parroted the Martin L. King line on the Vietnam War: " . . . The poor have no bread to put any butter on, because the war on poverty has been decimated by the drain on funds for the war in Vietnam. We are spending $56 billion for that war but a trickle for aiding the poor. In the South the program has been cut to nothing." He also echoed King when he discussed violence: "The Negro leaders and the Negro people are not the sponsors of violence. The cause of violence is poverty, lack of jobs, segregation, slums, disease, hunger. Take them away and you won't have violence. It's not the Negro leaders who are stirring up violence, it's these issues and the failure of the government to solve them." (On a later occasion, Bond did a masterful bit of rewriting history when he said: "The conservatives always are the perpetrators of violence." Historically, he said, violence "always comes from the right.")

By February 1968, Bond had changed his mind about a presidential ticket. He endorsed comedian and street demonstrator Dick Gregory as a presidential candidate, with Benjamin Spock as his vice-presidential running mate. Such "peace" candidates, according to Bond, would "drive out the aggression against the poor in America rather than the imaginary aggression from Hanoi."

The 1968 Democratic National Convention was the scene of Bond's most spectacular political triumph. At the convention, Bond was spokesman for the Southern Challenge Coordinating Committee, a delegation which set out to replace the regular convention delegates who had been selected by the Georgia Democratic Party. Bond's group was successful to the extent that they were awarded one-half of the seats in Georgia's delegation; and before the convention was concluded, Bond was nominated for the vice presidency of the United States, and received 43½ votes before he withdrew his name from consideration, his enthusiastic supporters having overlooked the fact that Bond was seven years too young to be eligible for the vice presidency.

After the Chicago convention, Bond was deluged with offers to speak at high schools and colleges across the country. *Life* magazine has hailed Bond as "the clearest, sanest, and one of the most responsible voices from the New Left." To one group, the clear, sane, and responsible voice of Bond said: "The police forces in this country are so ready, willing, and eager to retaliate [against violence by blacks]. I wouldn't be surprised if you saw them napalming people in the big cities within five years or so."

Before his student audiences, Bond offers New Left demagoguery, heavily salted with racism: The Vietnam war is a "racist" war. – "Asking a black man to help himself is like asking a man with no boots to pull himself up by the bootstraps." – Black people "with a hot dog pocketbook have won the right to eat steaks." – "The churches seemed like the ideal place to begin" demanding reparations for the black people. American blacks "want it [money] and need it – the churches have it. I don't think the churches are the only ones." He suggests that American business and industry pay reparations to the blacks and says the money could be used to build homes, to improve education, and in "one hundred thousand ways" by Negroes. The reparations fund could be administered through some kind of "national social welfare agency." – Democratic processes are "cumbersome and usually unresponsive" to blacks, who have "little or no access to the power center in America."

Bond skirts around forthright advocacy of violence but his equivocation is quite transparent: "I'm not saying I agree with anybody burning down anybody's home or business. But people who are cooped up are frightened and respond." – He can envision people seizing public facilities in an effort to achieve their goals. People who want and deserve welfare assistance could, for example, take over the welfare agencies. – Columbia University students seized campus buildings because "the democratic procedures not only are not working – they're not available."

Bond portrays America as gripped in an economic and class war, with the blacks on the losing side: "Instead of land or money, poor people are offered programs." – Americans spend as much for chewing gum as they do for the Model Cities program; as much for pet food as for food stamps for the poor.

Bond insists that "black capitalism" is not the answer to the Negroes' plight. He offers a Marxist solution of "community socialism" whereby a neighborhood has "the say in who gets how much and what from whom."

In January 1970, during an interview he taped for a television program in The Netherlands, Bond engaged in some exemplary tastelessness: "There seems to me to be a conscious conspiracy on the part of local police forces and state police forces and the federal police force [*sic*] – the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I think it comes from President Nixon and Attorney General Mitchell making a serious attempt to destroy the Black Panthers. They do it in two ways – one by political assassination and [the other] by political trials, the kind they have in the Soviet Union." When asked by his interviewer if President Nixon could be called a friend of the blacks, Bond replied: "If you could call Adolf Hitler a friend of the Jews, you could call President Nixon a friend of the blacks."

HAROLD A. BOSLEY was born on February 19, 1907 in Burchard, Nebraska, son of Effie Sinclair and Augustus Bosley. He married Margaret Dahlstrom. He is an alumnus of Nebraska Wesleyan College (A.B., 1930) and the University of Chicago (B.D., 1932; Ph.D., 1933). He is the author of *The Quest for Religious Certainty* (1939); *The Philosophical Heritage of the Christian Faith* (1945); *On Final Ground* (1946); *Main Issues Confronting Christendom* (1948); *The Church Militant* (1952); *Preaching on Controversial Issues* (1953); *What Did the World Council Say to You?* (1955); *Sermons on the Psalms* (1956); *Sermons on Genesis* (1958); *Doing What Is Christian* (1960); *He Spoke to Them in Parables* (1963); *The Mind of Christ* (1966); and *The Character of Christ* (1968).

In 1924, Bosley began his activism in the Methodist Church as a local preacher. In 1933, he was ordained an elder by the Nebraska Methodist Conference. From 1934 until 1938, he was director of religious activities at Iowa State Teachers College. From 1938 until 1947, he was a minister of the Mount Vernon Place Methodist Church in Baltimore, Maryland. From 1947 until 1950, he was dean of the Divinity School at Duke University. From 1950 until 1962, he was a minister of the First Methodist Church in Evanston, Illinois. Since 1962, he has been senior minister of Christ Church (Methodist) in New York City. He has been a visiting lecturer at many colleges and universities, including the Pacific School of Religion, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Tufts College, DePauw University, and McMurry College.

Bosley's affiliations have included the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims ("subversive" – "a Communist Party project"); the Chicago Sobell Committee ("Communist campaign"); the Church Peace Mission (leftwing-pacifist); the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); Promoting Enduring Peace (leftwing-pacifist); Southern Conference Educational Fund (financial backbone of racial agitators, including the "black power" revolutionaries); and the leftist-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Bosley joined in appeals for clemency to be extended to Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, and to Carl Braden, who was convicted for contempt of Congress; and in appeals for cessation of tests of nuclear weapons.

KATHY BOUDIN was born on May 19, 1943 in New York City, daughter of Jean Roisman and Leonard B. Boudin, the celebrated lawyer for the Left. Bryn Mawr College granted her a degree, in absentia, in 1965. She attended Bryn Mawr for three years, during which she became a civil rights agitator in Chester, Pennsylvania. (In 1964, she was co-chairman of the ultra-leftwing conference on the Second American Revolution.) She spent her senior collegiate year at the University of Moscow. (During her fifteen-month stay in the Soviet Union, Kathy Boudin was shocked and disappointed to find that Russian students did not share her enthusiasm for Socialism and enmity for capitalism.)

After she returned from the Soviet Union, Kathy Boudin spent three years in Cleveland, Ohio, as a community organizer – a euphemism for civil rights agitator.

During the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Kathy Boudin was a leader of militant demonstrators. She was arrested and charged with spilling butyric acid in the Palmer House hotel. For this action, she was placed under a one-year supervision by the Cook County Circuit Court; and for her role as a leader in the riots attendant to the Democratic Convention, she was named a co-conspirator in a federal indictment against the Chicago Seven (The Conspiracy), but she was never brought to trial.

In July 1969, Kathy Boudin, as a leader of Students for a Democratic Society, attended the National Anti-War Conference in Cleveland where Communists and representatives of various far-left organizations planned the so-called Moratorium demonstrations of November 1969 against the Vietnam War.

A few days after the Cleveland conference, Kathy Boudin – along with Eleanor Raskin, Brian Glick, and Gustin Reichbach – became a copyright owner of *the Bust Book* which was distributed by the Students for a Democratic Society. In its 1969 Annual Report, the House Internal Security Committee said: "*the Bust Book* instructs demonstrators not to accept from untrustworthy persons paper bags, paint, stink bombs, or marijuana. Illegal activities at demonstrations should be concealed, the book counsels, because many plainclothesmen who infiltrate crowds and participate in demonstrations 'are dressed and look like brothers.' Readers of *the Bust Book* are informed that the best place to conceal dope is in one's undergarments, because the police, when frisking a suspect on the street, do not search this part of the suspect's apparel. The book also gives instructions on how to refuse to talk to the police, how to refuse to be searched, and how to interfere with law enforcement officers who are trying to develop information concerning the possibility of a crime. Throughout the document, which reveals complete contempt for the law, the book's authors instruct youths on how to be evasive and on how to lie without getting caught when questioned by lawful authorities."

The HISC printed excerpts from *the Bust Book* in its hearings ("Investigation of Students for a Democratic Society," Part 5): "*Introduction:* The cop and the judge wear different uniforms, but they both serve the same system we seek to destroy . . . . (Page 1). The 'rights' of the Constitution have little meaning to the cop on the beat, who is engaged in the first step of the legal process, and they also have little meaning in the courts, where the final stages of coercion are legitimized. To rely on 'legal rights' is to ignore entirely the fundamental reality of a class society, that when those 'rights' have been granted by a ruling elite, those same 'rights' can and will be ignored when their use threatens the power of those who grant them. Such has been the history of 'fundamental rights' in our country in times of crisis from the Alien and Sedition Acts . . . to . . . the McCarthy repression which killed the Rosenbergs and led to the imprisonment of Morton Sobell and many others in the fifties, down to the frame-up and murder of members of the Black Panther Party today (Pages 1 and 2). Sometimes we can fight back using the legal rights and procedures which movements before us have won from the system. But we must not be diverted from political organizing by courtroom battles. Our real defense lies in the growing strength of our Movement (Attachment, Page 2).

"*Chapter I* – before the bust . . . . More and more of us are getting busted more and more. But getting arrested should be, as far as possible, a political decision. There are good political reasons to get busted – to mobilize a community or a campus (like in the Columbia [University] revolt), to take risks to be in the front lines of a demonstration (like at the Chicago Democratic Convention), or to do violence to the system, really or symbolically (destroying draft files) (Page 3). *Individual Cop-Frontation:* The cop is an enemy, but the enemy has to be attacked tactically. If you are alone with a cop there is nothing to gain from talking back to him. All the power is in his hands (Page 8). *In a Demonstration:* Self-Defense. The New York Times, although not useful for any other purpose, makes a very hard object when rolling [*sic*] up lengthwise and folded in half, and unlike other weapons is inconspicuous and not incriminating. When the police throw tear gas canisters into the crowd the gas continues to come out after it hits – throw the canisters off somewhere into the blue (Page 11).

"*Chapter VII* – Trial Strategy: How to Decide. It's important to bear in mind . . . that courts maintain the existing social order. They are not neutral arbiters of conflict, but part of the coercive apparatus of the people with power. They remove people from action, imprison them or tie them up in defense (Page 60). Conventional Legal Defense: Legal technicalities have also been used to delay final judgment on a case until the political situation changed to the defendant's benefit. After the Columbia University busts, the defense lawyers stalled until the new University administration was appointed, which dropped the complaints against five hundred of the students (Page 62). Political-Legal Defense: One purpose of a political-legal defense is to use the courtroom as a classroom and teach about the role of law and courts in the United States. The defense can be conducted so as to reveal what, in fact, is on trial . . . . A political-legal defense can also stimulate political activity. The trial of four leaders of the Buffalo movement led to mass rallies on the University of Buffalo campus and raised fists in the courtroom protesting the sentencing of the one defendant found guilty (Page 63). Representing Yourself: It is disturbing to the judge and the other courtroom personnel for you to defend yourself. It challenges their whole sense of professionalism. It is very important to break down the god-like aura that surrounds the judge and the entire legal system (Page 65)."

More of Kathy Boudin's activities were described in the House Internal Security Committee's Report, *SDS Plans for America's High Schools:* "In July of 1969 a delegation of SDS leaders, including Bernardine Rae Dohrn, member of the national interim committee of SDS; Kathie [Kathy] Boudin of the SDS national action staff; and Dianne Maria Donghi, Theodore (Ted) Gold, Eleanor Stein Raskin, and Howard Jefferson (Jeff) Melish of New York's SDS organization, were part of a larger delegation of Americans who went to Cuba to meet with Viet Cong and North Vietnamese representatives.

"In a special 'Vietnam Supplement' to *New Left Notes* published after that visit, Vietnamese advice on the best type of recruit for the SDS was quoted: 'At the meeting in Cuba with the PRG [Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, basically consisting of elements of the Viet Cong], Van Ba (head of the PRG delegation) told us: When you go into a city, look for the person who fights hardest against the cops. That's the one you talk all night with. Don't look for the one who says the best thing. Look for the one who fights.' " (Kathy Boudin has been identified by Radio Havana as a member of the Venceremos Brigade.)

Kathy Boudin has not only been a leader of SDS but also a leader of SDS's most militant group – the Weatherman faction. In 1969, she joined Terry Robbins, Bernardine Dohrn, Mark Rudd, and Bill Ayers in issuing the basic Weatherman call for immediate steps to destroy the United States from inside by "revolutionary struggle now."

In September 1969, members of the Weatherman faction, including Kathy Boudin, were very much in evidence when the trial of The Conspiracy opened in Chicago. On two occasions, Kathy Boudin was arrested and charged with aggravated battery for allegedly striking policemen. On December 19, 1969, she was indicted and freed on $10,000 bail. At about the same time, the Weatherman faction decided to go underground. When Kathy Boudin followed this strategy, she did not appear in court to answer the aggravated battery charges. Her bail was revoked, a warrant was issued for her arrest for unlawful flight from prosecution, and her bail was reset at $75,000.

Until March 6, 1970, Kathy Boudin remained out of sight while agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation sought her and other members of the Weatherman group. On that date, however, an explosion took place in a townhouse in the Greenwich Village section of New York City. The townhouse, owned by James P. Wilkerson, had been converted into a bomb factory by the Weatherman group, three of whom were killed by the explosion: Theodore Gold, Terry Robbins, and Diana Oughton. Cathlyn Wilkerson, daughter of the townhouse's owner, and Kathy Boudin were seen by neighbors fleeing from the scene of the explosion. They remain fugitives from justice while law enforcement authorities speculate that they may be in Canada.

LEONARD B. BOUDIN was born on July 20, 1912 in Brooklyn, New York. He married Jean Roisman. He attended the City College of New York and is an alumnus of St. John's University (LL.B., 1936).

On June 12, 1956, in testimony

before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Boudin denied under oath that he had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

Boudin's career before and since 1956 has been so closely affiliated with Communists, Communist fronts, and fellow-travelers that a curious interrogator could reasonably be expected to ask him whether he is a member of the Communist Party, and if not, why not.

Boudin has been an official of the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); a member of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); a writer for *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); a lecturer at the Jefferson School for Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); a contributor to the political campaign of Communist Robert Treuhaft; and a sponsor of a testimonial dinner to Communist leader Herbert Aptheker.

Boudin has been an attorney for the government of Communist Cuba, for the American Civil Liberties Union (that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness), the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"), and the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"). His clients have included such luminaries of the left as Benjamin Spock, Paul Robeson, Soviet spy Judith Coplon, Julian Bond, Waldo Frank, Lionel Stander, Abraham Glasser, Clark Foreman, Kenneth Tynan, Robert Taber, and Victor Rabinowitz.

Artists, academicians, entertainers, former government employees, and various members of other professions have called upon Boudin's services as an attorney when they appeared before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or other congressional committees investigating subversion. In most instances, when Boudin's clients have appeared before such committees, they have resorted to use of the Fifth Amendment when questioned about their affiliations with the Communist Party. These Fifth Amendment pleaders have included: Joseph Alfone Jr., Arnold Arnstein, Arthur Behrstock, Victor Berman, Ivan Black, Winifred and Robert Blanchard, Stanley Blumenthal, Philip Boothroyd, Robert Claiborne, Charles Colcord, Sarah Cunningham, Hugh Deane, Dorothy Friedman, Morton Friedman, Joseph Furst, Solomon Golat, Sidney Gluck, Evelyn Goldberg, Murray Goldberg, David Gordon, Louis Graedler, Lee Grant, Horace Grenell, Frank Grumman, Jack Harris, Simon Heimlich, Sterling Hunkins, Simeon Jurist, George Keane, Tony Kraber, Madeline Lee, Harold Lippman, Hugh Malzac, Stanley W. Moore, Sam Morgenstern, Fred Muller, Myer Naigles, Wayne Paschal, Leon Portnoy, John Powell, Marie Prince, John Randolph, Lawrence Rosinger, June Rotenberg, Randolph Smith, Louis Solomon, Joseph Spencer, Sarah Starr, Jeanette Sussman, Harold Townsend, Leonard Tushnet, and Anita Willcox.

Those clients of Boudin's who did not plead the Fifth Amendment generally revealed, during the course of their testimony before congressional committees, that they were fellow travelers of the Communist Party – such individuals as John Kingsbury, Otto Nathan, Martin Popper, and Henry Willcox.

Boudin's name appeared prominently in the railroading of Otto Otepka, the State Department security officer who labored valiantly to eliminate subversive influences in the State Department. When Otepka was facing dismissal from the State Department, his attorney filed a brief with the hearing officer who was presiding over Otepka's appeal. The brief dealt at length with Boudin's influence within high government circles: "On July 30, 1962, the New York *Times* published a letter signed by one Leonard B. Boudin. The letter appeared under the heading 'Screening U.N. Employes.' In his letter Boudin complained about the security screening of U.N. employes. He said that 'the careers of many devoted and brilliant international civil servants were destroyed in the hysteria of the 1950s.'

"He deplored the fact that 'the United States government is still enforcing President Truman's and President Eisenhower's Executive Orders which screen, on political grounds, American employes of the United Nations and other international organizations. The expressed criteria include membership on the attorney general's list; the sources include derogatory information in congressional committee files; the procedures are based on undisclosed evidence. Such screening is inconsistent with the Charter's principle . . . the present Administration would now score a major achievement if it were to . . . eliminate its so-called loyalty program in the international field.' In the course of his discussion Boudin mentioned the resignation of Andrew Cordier from the U.N. secretariat.

"Otepka knew that Leonard Boudin had for many years been intimately involved with the Communist party and Communist affairs. He had been active in defending persons against allegations of communism, and had represented certain officials of the United Nations who were dismissed after refusing to answer questions put to them by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

"An official in the Department of Justice sent Reilly a clipping from the New York *Times* containing the Boudin letter of July 30, 1962. The clipping, covered by a Department of Justice 'routing slip' with a personal note in longhand addressed to Reilly, reached him Aug. 1, 1962. On Aug. 3, 1962, Reilly initialed the slip and sent it, together with the clipping, to Otepka.

"In August 1962 Otepka was officially informed by memoranda to the Office of Security that Harlan Cleveland wished to set up an Advisory Committee on International Organizations. Mr. Cleveland had personally selected the eight members of the committee. He wished them to be appointed immediately without preappointment investigation – in other words, he wished to invoke the waiver procedures.

"Otepka objected, pointing out that earlier in the year emergency clearances had been curtailed and further pointing out that background data on certain of the individuals involved required a full investigation and a careful review of the results of that investigation before their entry on duty. Otepka documented his objections in memoranda to Reilly, one of which, the memorandum of Sept. 10, 1962, is State Department Exhibit 7, which is the basis of Charge No. 1.

"Otepka was especially concerned about three of the men selected by Mr. Cleveland for membership on his committee. These three men were Harding Bancroft, Ernest Gross and Andrew Cordier – the same individual mentioned by Mr. Boudin in his letter. The record revealed that one or more of these men had served on the personal staff of Alger Hiss in the State Department, that all three had close and sympathetic associations with him, that they had stated they did not believe in his guilt, and that in their opinion he was not a security risk.

"In Otepka's opinion this derogatory security information demanded complete resolution before these persons were appointed. Otepka brought these matters to Reilly's attention by memoranda.

"The objections of Otepka were met or circumvented by Cleveland and Reilly, who decided that the members of the committee 'would be entered on the rolls of the State Department as consultants, and that they would serve on an ad hoc basis, that the positions to which they would be appointed would be designated as nonsensitive rather than sensitive as initially proposed. Therefore, under the security procedures these individuals could be given assignments in the department without a prior investigation – that is, before appointment – with the explicit understanding that they would be given access to only such information as they needed in the performance of their work on the committee, and not to have any general access to any other information normally available to people in the State Department who have full clearance.'

"On Feb. 19, 1963, the Advisory Committee submitted a draft report to the Department of State and the report was circulated in the department. Otepka obtained a copy of this draft report from a member of the Bureau of International Organizations, which was headed by Mr. Cleveland. He discovered that recommendations in the draft report coincided with the position taken by Boudin in his letter to the New York *Times;* they would have implemented the suggestion of Boudin that pre-employment investigation of American appointees to U.N. agencies be dispensed with.

"Otepka observed further that in general the draft report recommended a reversion to the program and procedures advocated and administered by Alger Hiss for the screening of American personnel in the United Nations. In this connection Otepka recalled that in 1946 Hiss had prepared a list of 200 people whose names were submitted by the State Department to the U.N. as possible appointees to U.N. jobs. It turned out that 40 of these persons who had subversive connections were later dismissed from the United Nations, and 26 of the 40 invoked the plea of incrimination while testifying before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee.

"Otepka brought the February 19 draft report to the attention of Reilly, and gave him a detailed memorandum setting out the facts and Otepka's views. Otepka never learned what Reilly's views were. 'He kept telling me that he didn't have time to read my recommendations and suggestions.'

"On April 22, 1963, the Advisory Committee submitted a revised draft of its report, from which the recommendations coinciding with the views of Boudin and Hiss had been stricken."

Probably no circumstance contributed more to Otepka's downfall and the subsequent ruination of the State Department security procedures than his adamant refusal to accept the Boudin recommendations, which were promoted by the Justice Department and Otepka's State Department colleagues.

KENNETH E. BOULDING was born on January 18, 1910 in Liverpool, England, son of Elizabeth Rowe and William Boulding. He settled in the United States in 1937 and was naturalized eleven years later. He married Elise Biorn-Hansen. He is an alumnus of Oxford University (B.A., 1931; M.A., 1939). He studied on a fellowship at the University of Chicago from 1932 until 1934. He is the author of *Economic Analysis* (1941); *Economics of Peace* (1945); *There Is a Spirit* (1945); *A Reconstruction of Economics* (1950); *The Organizational Revolution* (1953); *The Image* (1956); *Principles of Economic Policy* (1958); *The Skills of the Economist* (1958); *Conflict and Defense* (1962); *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* (1964); *The Impact of the Social Sciences* (1966); and *Beyond Economics* (1968); co-author of *Linear Programming and the Theory of the Firm* (1960); and co-editor of *Disarmament and the Economy* (1963).

From 1934 until 1937, Boulding was a teaching assistant at the University of Edinburgh. From 1937 until 1941, he was an economics instructor at Colgate University. In 1941 and 1942, he was an economist in the economic and financial section of the League of Nations. In 1942 and 1943, he was a professor of economics at Fisk University. From 1943 until 1946, he was an associate professor of economics at Iowa State College. In 1946 and 1947, he was a professor of political economy at McGill University. From 1947 until 1949, he was a professor of economics at Iowa State College. From 1949 until 1967, he was a professor of economics at the University of Michigan, and from 1964 until 1966, research director for the University's Center for Research in Conflict Resolution. [In 1963, he participated in the International Arms Control Symposium at the University of Michigan – a gathering of leftwing disarmament and appeasement addicts.] In 1967 and 1968, he was a visiting professor at the University of Colorado. Since 1968, he has been a professor at the University of Colorado and director of a program on general social and economic dynamics at the University's Institute for Behavioral Science. He has been a visiting professor at University College of the West Indies in Jamaica (1959-1960) and at International Christian University (1963-1964). He was a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Palo Alto, California (1954-1955).

Boulding has a history of affiliations with leftwing groups. He has supported the leftwing-pacifist Women Strike for Peace. He has been affiliated with the leftwing-pacifist Congress of Scientists on Survival, the Student Peace Union, and Our Generation against Nuclear War. He was a member of the Norman Thomas Eightieth Birthday Anniversary Committee, a tribute to the patriarch of the Socialist Party in the United States. He participated in the Jane Addams Centennial, a tribute to one of America's most leftwing radicals of all time. He was a member of the Council for Correspondence, founded by a small group of leftwing extremists. He has been affiliated with *Liberation* magazine, a radical-pacifist publication. He was on a Committee to Sponsor a Meeting to Hear Harold Davies, a British far-left extremist. He participated in the 1964 meeting of the World Peace Study Mission to welcome Japanese survivors of U.S. atomic bombings in World War II – a project of far-left pacifists. He petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden when those two leftists were convicted of contempt of Congress. He frequently petitioned for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He petitioned against the Internal Security Act of 1950. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists. He is a sponsor of the National Council to Repeal the Draft, a leftwing group with the hysterically dishonest theme: "The draft has effectively abolished the freedom of American men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six."

ROBERT R. BOWIE was born on August 24, 1909 in Baltimore, Maryland, son of Helen Richardson and Clarence Bowie. He married Theodosia Chapman. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1931) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1934). He is the author of *Shaping the Future* (1964), editor and co-author of *Studies in Federalism* (1954), co-author of *Ideology and Foreign Affairs* (1960), co-author of *The European Economic Community and the United States* (1961), and a contributor to *The Secretary of State* (1960), *Arms Control* (1961), and *The Atlantic Community* (1963). His articles have appeared in the *New York Times Magazine*, *Daedalus*, and *Foreign Affairs*.

From 1934 until 1942, Bowie had a private law practice in Baltimore. From 1939 until 1941, he was a reporter for the Maryland Committee on Civil Procedure. In 1940 and 1941, he was the assistant director of the Maryland Legislative Council. In 1941 and 1942, he was an assistant attorney general of Maryland. From 1942 until 1946, he served in the United States Army. In 1945 and 1946, he was a special assistant to the deputy military governor of Germany, working under General Lucius Clay. From 1946 until 1955, he held the rank of professor of law at Harvard University, but he spent most of those years on leave of absence. In 1948, he was director of a task force regulatory commission of the Committee on Reorganization of Government. In 1950 and 1951, he was general counsel and special adviser to the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, John McCloy. From 1953 until 1955, he was director of the policy planning staff of the State Department and a member of the planning board of the National Security Council. In 1956 and 1957, he was the assistant secretary of state for policy planning in the State Department. From 1966 until 1968, he was counselor of the State Department. (Bowie admitted that his predecessor, George Ball, along with Dean Rusk and Lyndon Johnson, convinced him that he should accept the position as counselor. The *New York Times* said [August 17, 1966]: "It is widely reported that Mr. Bowie's selection as Counselor was pushed by Mr. Ball . . . to keep a man of similar views in a top spot.") Since 1957, with interruptions for his State Department service, Bowie has been professor of international relations and the director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University.

On two occasions (1956 and 1966), when Bowie's appointments (assistant secretary of state and counselor) required Senate confirmation, he testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On both occasions, he revealed himself to be a master of evasion and of bureaucratic doubletalk. Time and time again he was called upon to clarify his answers, but in most instances he resorted to loquacity without substance. The exceptions were those answers which would obviously please the majority of the committee's members.

From the entire context of Bowie's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, he emerged as a full-blown, leftwing internationalist. The leftwing line was evident in his views on every issue which arose during the course of the Committee's interrogation. He has advocated repeal of the Connally Reservation, a measure designed to protect the internal affairs of the United States from interference by the United Nations. He has urged the creation of an international peace force under the auspices of the United Nations. He has supported extensive foreign "aid" handouts to underdeveloped nations.

(In his *Shaping the Future,* Bowie expressed his opposition to annual congressional review of U.S. foreign "aid" appropriations. He favored a system whereby all such "aid" would be dispersed through international agencies, particularly the United Nations Special Fund.)

Bowie holds to the theory that eastern European nations are evolving toward independence and that it behooves the United States to build trade and cultural bridges to the East. He has been a long-time advocate of an organized Atlantic community built on the framework of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. (He has been a member of the Atlantic Council of the United States and the Council on Foreign Relations, both of which are committed to any and all steps that might lead toward world government.) And he is one of the better-known proponents of an integrated Europe. In this proposal, he follows the well-worn line of leftwing internationalists as he condemns "nation states" that will not bury old rivalries and escape from nationalism.

Toward the Soviet Union, Bowie has always been willing to offer appeasement. He talks of the Soviet Union as a nation, making no reference to the captive states within the Soviet orbit. He has applauded every step toward United States disarmament and has admitted being one of the original peaceniks in the Eisenhower Administration. (In one of Bowie's most memorable public appearances, he addressed the Ninth International Banking Summer School at Rutgers University. Harrison Salisbury reported the event in the *New York Times* [July 10, 1956]: "Nine Iron Curtain financiers sat jowl by jowl with nearly 200 key men in Western finance . . . . The first thing the Communist bankers heard was a forecast by Robert R. Bowie, Assistant Secretary of State, that – at present rates of growth – the Soviet Union and its satellite states would forge ahead of Western Europe's economic output within the next two decades. Mr. Bowie warned that the Soviet leadership was 'clearly counting on this material progress to shift the balance of power in the world.' When he concluded he was applauded politely by Vladimir Gerashchenko, deputy chairman of the State Bank of the Soviet Union. [Gerashchenko's restraint was remarkable since Bowie not only accepted Soviet claims for economic progress but completely overlooked Soviet militarism, subversion, terrorism, and diplomatic trickery and duplicity as weapons to shift the balance of power in the world.] . . . Mr. Bowie, who is chief of the plans and policy section of the State Department, estimated present Soviet output at about one-third of the United States. That of the Soviet bloc as a whole he fixed at somewhat more than half that of the United States. 'The Soviet rulers are counting heavily on the economic growth of the Soviet Union and other countries of the Soviet bloc,' he said.

'We would be most unwise to ignore the material results they have achieved.' ")

When Bowie's appointment as State Department counselor was pending, *Human Events* (July 23, 1966) reported: "Former staffers on the National Security Council regard Bowie as a 'soft-liner' with Socialist tendencies. These staffers insist that Bowie quietly pushed for the following policies, even though he has publicly denied advocating some of them: Recognition of Communist China and its admission to the United Nations; trade with Communist China; Chiang Kai-shek's abandonment of the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu; expanded East-West trade; a drastic reduction of American military power on the European continent; large-scale economic aid to Tito; a downgrading of our nuclear capacity."

In his position as director of Harvard's Center for International Affairs, Bowie has been able to provide a haven for leftwing scholars, American and alien, whose influence upon American foreign policy is enhanced by Bowie's former prestigious positions in the Truman, Eisenhower, and Johnson Administrations.

THEODORE BRAMELD was born on January 20, 1904 in Neillsville, Wisconsin, son of Minnie Dangers and Theodore Brameld. He was married to Georgene Shields. He is married to Ona Swanson. He is an alumnus of Ripon College (B.A., 1926) and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1931).

From 1926 until 1928, Brameld was field secretary of Ripon College. From 1929 until 1931, he was a fellow at the University of Chicago. From 1931 to 1935, he was a philosophy instructor at Long Island University. From 1935 until 1939, he was an assistant professor (1935-1938) and associate professor (1938-1939) of philosophy at Adelphi College. From 1939 to 1947, he was an associate professor (1939-1944) and professor (1945-1947) of educational philosophy at the University of Minnesota. From 1947 until 1958, he was a professor of educational philosphy at New York University. Since 1958, he has been a professor of educational philosophy at Boston University. He has also been a visiting lecturer at Columbia University, the University of Wisconsin, Dartmouth College, the University of Puerto Rico, and the New School for Social Research.

Brameld has been the author, coauthor, or editor of about twenty books. His articles and book reviews have appeared in a wide variety of publications, including *Saturday Review, School and Society, Journal of Educational Sociology, Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Educational Forum,* and *New Republic.* He has also been a book reviewer and contributing editor to *Science and Society* ("a Communist publication"), and he has been affiliated with *The Communist* ("the official organ of the Communist Party of America").

Brameld has been an officer and/or member of the American Federation of Teachers, the American Association of University Professors, the American Philosophical Association, the American Educational Fellowship, the Philosophy of Education Society, the American Anthropological Association, the Society for Applied Anthropology, the National Education Association, and the John Dewey Society. From 1947 until 1952, he was a consultant to the Anti-Defamation League. In 1962 and 1963, he lectured in Japan and Korea, under the auspices of the U.S. Department of State, on American civilization and education. Between 1953 and 1964, he received five grants from the Wenner-Gren Foundation. In 1964 and 1965, he was a Fulbright research scholar in Japan. Earlier in his career, he had been awarded a scholarship by the Institute of Pacific Relations ("a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives").

Brameld has been affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims ("subversive"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio ("Communist front"); the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive"); and the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign ("Communist front"). He has petitioned on behalf of imprisoned Communist Party leaders and fellow-traveling teachers. He petitioned for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was a national committeeman in Henry A. Wallace's presidential campaign – a campaign wholly endorsed by the Communist Party. He was affiliated with the Committee for a Democratic Spain and the Emergency Committee for Disaster Relief to Cuba, organizations that were completely dominated by fellow travelers of the Communists. He opposed the HCUA hearings on the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee, a pro-Castro organization.

In the field of education, Brameld is a complete collectivist and, as such, he is an ardent devotee of federal subsidies for education and a staunch proponent of forced racial integration of schools. His contribution to educational philosophy has been "reconstructionism," a blend of John Dewey's pragmatism and Karl Marx's socialism. And, in recent years, he has also promoted "anthropotherapy" – his own coinage – which he described in his *The Use of Explosive Ideas in Education* (1965) as concepts that "have the power to remake reality . . . that enable man . . . to reinterpret and often to control . . . [his] experience so that no longer does it mean what it meant before."

Brameld has not always been abstruse in his method of expression. For example, in 1947, when the American Education Fellowship commissioned him to draft "A New Policy for the AEF," he produced a highly readable manifesto for socialist educational goals:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system, a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional free enterprise; . . . a system in which the interests, wants, and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people, a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned 'public' utilities . . . .

"II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; . . . an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards, is practiced, parallel with the best standard of individual nations . . . an order in which world citizenship thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

HARRISON BROWN was born on September 26, 1917 in Sheridan, Wyoming, son of Agatha Scott and Harrison Brown. He married Rudd Owen. He is an alumnus of the University of California (B.S., 1938) and Johns Hopkins University (Ph.D., 1941). He is the author of *Must Destruction Be Our Destiny?* (1946); *The Challenge of Man's Future* (1954); *The Next Hundred Years* (1957); and *The Cassiopeia Affair* (1968). He is an editor-at-large of *Saturday Review.*

In 1941 and 1942, Brown was a chemistry instructor at Johns Hopkins University. In 1942 and 1943, he was a research associate on a plutonium project at the University of Chicago. From 1943 until 1946, he was the assistant director of chemistry at the Clinton Laboratories in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. From 1946 until 1951, he was at the University of Chicago's Institute for Nuclear Studies as assistant professor (1946-1948) and associate professor (1948-1951). Since 1951, he has been at the California Institute of Technology as professor of geochemistry (1951-1968) and, since 1968, professor of science.

Brown has been a national board member of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been a sponsor of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been a consultant and member of the board of directors of the socialist-oriented Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

In 1960, with James Real, Brown wrote a pamphlet, *Community of Fear,* for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. The foreword was provided by Reinhold Niebuhr, one of America's all-time champion Communist-fronters.

Community of Fear remains as a classical example of scare-mongering about thermonuclear war as a means of promoting accommodation treaties with the Soviet Union. It is doubtful if Real and Brown in their brief treatise omitted any clichés common to the disarmament buffs. The authors laid particular stress on "accidental and catalytic war." In a rare display of balance they said: "It is conceivable that military officials in the U.S. or the U.S.S.R. might bring about a *coup* and order an attack of their own without adequate approval." But in a passage that brought gleeful approval in the Communist press, the authors envisioned the U.S. as much more vulnerable to a *coup* by military hotheads: "As the Russian military position becomes more clearly dominant in the next decade, and as increasing psychological pressure is brought to bear on the Western positions everywhere, the likelihood of desperate, erratic, unauthorized action by U.S. and Allied forces is much greater than the chance of similar breaches of discipline by the Soviets. For one thing, the Soviet political and military policies are one policy, responsive only to the master plan of action – whatever it may be. For another, the Soviets have a polished method at hand for 'violation by proxy,' the calculated use of dominated or threatened powers to perform acts of belligerence which the U.S.S.R. may disclaim. The U.S.-NATO alliance, on the other hand, is hampered operationally by political differences, exposure inequities, geographic awkwardness which complicates logistic and communication problems, and, to some extent, language difficulties.

"Thus, if things continue the way they are going, the possibility of a *coup* by the United States military is real. The general assumption that the American soldier is automatically responsive to his civilian masters might be rudely shaken were there a serious and clearly visible retreat on the world front by the American policy-makers. The same might be true in the event of a disarmament agreement which the military does not consider fool-proof.

"In addition to accident, it is possible that the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. can become involved in a war which neither nation wants as the result of the catalytic action of a third nation. For example, New York, Washington, Los Angeles, and San Francisco might suddenly be destroyed by thermonuclear weapons launched from submarines. The submarines themselves might not be identifiable, but we might with good reason suspect them to be from the Soviet Union. Under the circumstances we might launch a devastating attack upon that country, not realizing that a third country (China? Japan? Argentina?), rather than the Soviet Union, had attacked us."

JOHN A. BROWN JR. was born on July 15, 1918 in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, son of Agnes Smith and John Brown. He married Franceline Harrison. He is an alumnus of Temple University (A.B., 1943) and the University of Chicago (M.A., 1945).

From 1943 until 1948, he was a production editor for Time, Incorporated. From 1948 until 1960, he was at Temple University as: assistant professor of political science (1948-1954); dean of men (1952-1955); and assistant to the president (1955-1960). [At Temple, in 1951 and 1952, Brown was a Fund for the Advancement of Education fellow. The FAE was a creation of the notorious leftwinger Robert M. Hutchins.] From 1960 until 1963, he was a vice president of Occidental College in Los Angeles. From 1963 until 1966, he was a vice president of George Washington University. Since 1966, he has been president of Lindenwood College in Missouri.

Brown has found a niche in the leftwing Establishment. Since 1961, he has frequently served as a consultant to the ultra-leftist Ford Foundation. Since 1960, he has directed at least five regional American Assemblies, which emanate from Columbia University and are brainwashing projects wherein American business executives are fed an up-to-date version of the State Department's soft-on-Communism, internationalist line. He has been an officer of Clarence Streit's Federal Union and the International Movement for Atlantic Union, two leftist-globalist organizations. Brown has written that he began speaking for Atlantic Union when he was a collegian.

JOHN MASON BROWN was born on July 3, 1900 in Louisville, Kentucky, son of Carrie Ferguson and John Mason Brown. He married Catherine Meredith. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1923). He is the author of *The Modern Theatre in Revolt* (1929); *Upstage: The American Theatre in Performance* (1930); *Letters from Greenroom Ghosts* (1934); *The Art of Playgoing* (1936); *Two on the Aisle* (1938); *Broadway in Review* (1940); *Accustomed As I Am* (1942); *Insides Out* (1942); *To All Hands* (1943); *Many a Watchful Night* (1944); *Seeing Things* (1946); *Seeing More Things* (1948); *Morning Faces* (1949); *As They Appear* (1952); *Daniel Boone: The Opening of the Wilderness* (1952); *Through These Men* (1956); *Dramatis Personae* (1963); and *The Worlds of Robert E. Sherwood: Mirror to His Times* (1965). Periodically, since 1923, Brown has lectured on various phases of the theatre from public forums and at a number of institutions including the University of Montana, the American Laboratory Theatre, Yale University, Middlebury College, and Harvard University.

From 1924 until 1928, Brown was associate editor and drama critic of *Theatre Arts Monthly.* From 1929 until 1941, he was drama critic for the *New York Evening Post.* In 1941 and 1942, he was drama critic for the *New York World-Telegram.* Since 1944, he has been with *Saturday Review*: associate editor (1944-1945); drama critic (1944-1955); and since 1955, editor-at-large.

Brown, in an effort to be objective during his years as a drama critic, refrained from friendships and acquaintanceships with personalities in the theatre. However, his leftist-liberal bias was evident in many of his writings (for example, in his biography of Sherwood) and other activities. Since 1956, he has been a judge for the Book-of-the-Month Club, whose selections have always been weighted heavily in favor of leftist-liberal authors. His bias was noticeable in his radio and television work on the CBS radio program *Of Men and Books,* the CBS television program *Last Word*, and the ABC television program *Critic-at-Large.*

In the 1930's, Brown was affiliated with the Communist front complex of the New Theatre-Group Theatre-Committee against Theatre Censorship-National Committee against Censorship of the Theatre Arts. In recent years, Brown has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness; and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

QUENTIN BURDICK was born on June 19, 1908 in Munich, North Dakota, son of Emma Robertson and Usher Burdick. He was married to the late Marietta Janecky. He is married to Jocelyn Birch Peterson. He is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota (B.A., 1931; LL.B., 1932). In 1932, he was admitted to North Dakota's bar; until 1958, he had a private law practice in Fargo.

In the 1930's, Burdick was counsel for the Farmers Union, and in 1932, he became a member of the Nonpartisan League (NPL), which was, at that time, a politically independent group concerned mainly with promoting farmers' interests by advocating federal governmental subsidies and the formation of farmers' cooperatives.

Between 1932 and 1942, the NPL supported Burdick on the Republican ticket as an unsuccessful candidate for the state senate, for state attorney (twice), and for lieutenant governor. In 1946, Burdick, as a Democrat, was an unsuccessful gubernatorial candidate. Between 1946 and 1956, he was effective in persuading the NPL to support Democrat candidates; in 1956, he was again an unsuccessful candidate, this time for the U.S. Senate on the Democrat-NPL ticket.

In 1958, Burdick was elected Congressman-at-Large. He was the Democrat-NPL candidate and the first North Dakota Democrat ever sent to the House of Representatives. In 1960, as a Democrat-NPL candidate, he was sent to the U.S. Senate in a special election. (He succeeded the late William Langer, who died with four and a half years of his Senate term remaining.) He was re-elected to the Senate in 1964.

In both the House and Senate, Burdick's voting record on domestic and foreign issues has been consistently with the ultra-liberal bloc. Repeatedly, he has demonstrated that he is a firm believer in centralized, paternalistic, and socialistic government. He is a spendthrift. He is an internationalist, a devotee of the United Nations, a dove on Vietnam, and a foreign "aid" advocate. Throughout the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, he was one of the most reliable hacks in the Democrat Party. During the Nixon Administration, he has resisted all but Democrat-sponsored legislation.

FREDERICK H. BURKHARDT was born on September 13, 1912 in Brooklyn, son of Marie Neumaier and Louis Burkhardt. He married Margaret Ross. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1933; Ph.D., 1940) and Oxford University (B. Litt., 1935), where he was a fellow of Oriel College.

From 1937 until 1943, Burkhardt was, successively, an instructor and assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. From 1943 until 1945, he was with the Red-saturated Office of Strategic Services as a research analyst of Central European Affairs. In 1945 and 1946, he was with the Department of State as acting chief of the Division of Research for Europe. In 1946 and 1947, he was an associate professor of philosophy at the University of Wisconsin. From 1947 until 1957, he was president of Bennington College in Vermont. (Bennington's atmosphere of bohemianism, its unorthodox curriculum, and its emphasis on permissiveness have made the institution a model for leftist-oriented campus radicalism.)

Since 1957, Burkhardt has been president of the American Council of Learned Societies. (The ACLS, a federation of scholarly organizations in the humanities and social sciences, is financed for the most part by foundations. In its fifty-year history, the ACLS has been a boon to scholars on the left who receive awards and grants from the Council.) During Burkhardt's presidency, he has been especially active in promoting exchanges of scholars between the United States and the Soviet Union and its satellites. He has also been a very persistent pleader for federal subsidies for the humanities.

Away from the campus and his work with the American Council of Learned Societies, Burkhardt spent 1950 and 1951 as deputy director of the office of public affairs in the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, John J. McCloy, the panjandrum of the Liberal Establishment. From 1959 until 1964, Burkhardt was a member of the U.S. National Commission for [the Red-saturated] UNESCO. From 1962 until 1968, he was a panel member on educational research and development in President Lyndon Johnson's Office of Science and Technology. In 1964, President Johnson awarded Burkhardt the Medal of Freedom.

Burkhardt is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. In earlier years, he was affiliated with the Spanish Refugee Appeal ("subversive" – "Communist front") and the Committee of Welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson (a tribute to Britain's most notorious Red clergyman).

ARTHUR F. BURNS was born on April 27, 1904 in Stanislau, Austria, son of Sarah Juran and Nathan Burns. He came to the United States at the age of ten. He married Helen Bernstein. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1925; A.M., 1925; Ph.D., 1934). He is the author of *Production Trends in the U.S. Since 1870* (1934); *Economic Research and the Keynesian Thinking of Our Times* (1946); *Frontiers of Economic Knowledge* (1954); *Prosperity without Inflation* (1957); *The Management of Prosperity* (1966); and *The Business Cycle in a Changing World* (1969). He is co-author of *Measuring Business Cycles* (with Wesley C. Mitchell, 1946); *Full Employment, Guideposts and Economic Stability* (with Paul A. Samuelson, 1967); and *The Defense Sector and the American Economy* (with Jacob Javits and Charles Hitch, 1968). (By any reasonable standards, every one of Burns' collaborators should be deemed to be positioned on the left of the political spectrum.)

From 1927 until 1944, Burns was in the economics department of Rutgers University: instructor (1927-1930); assistant professor (1930-1933); associate professor (1933-1943); and professor (1943-1944). From 1941 until 1969, Burns was associated with the economics department of Columbia University: visiting lecturer (1941-1942); visiting professor (1942-1944); professor, (1944-1959); and, from 1959 until 1969, he held the John Bates Clark chair in economics. He has been a visiting lecturer at Fordham University, New York University, Stanford University, and Carnegie Institute of Technology.

From 1930 until 1968, Burns was associated with the National Bureau of Economic Research: research associate, (1930-1931); researcher, (1933-1945); research director, (1945-1953); president (1957-1967); chairman, (1967-1968); and honorary chairman (1968).

During the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations, Burns held consultative positions with various federal departments and agencies. In the Eisenhower Administration, from 1953 until 1956, he was chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and chairman of the Advisory Board on Economic Growth and Stability. In the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, from 1961 until 1966, he was a member of the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management. Early in the Nixon Administration, in 1969, he was Counsellor to the President, with cabinet status. In 1970, he became Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

In the academic community and within governmental circles, Burns has been one of the better known economists. While with the National Bureau of Economic Research, he acquired a reputation as a student of business cycles. He charted hundreds of economic indicators and selected about twenty of them as true reflections of cyclic trends in the nation's economy. During the Eisenhower Administration, he was generally considered by political and economic observers to be the most liberal influence in the Administration, and it was then that Burns and Vice President Richard Nixon formed a mutual admiration society.

During the 1968 presidential campaign, Burns played a very prominent role in Nixon's top echelon of advisers. And in Nixon's first year in the White House, Burns, in the newly-created post of Counsellor, was the President's chief adviser on all domestic matters – even those ranging far beyond the area of economics.

For reasons that remain inexplicable, Burns has become a "conservative" in the judgment of political and economic observers – a sharp contrast to the "liberal" label he was given just a few years ago. What makes the change startling is that his economic theories have not altered. He has been consistent in advocating that the federal government should use its fiscal and monetary powers to regulate the nation's economy. He does not view Congress' taxing power as essentially a revenue-raising vehicle, but rather as a means to regulate the inflation-deflation processes. He has generally talked a good fight against inflation. Yet at the same time he upholds the principle that federal funds should be spent on such extra-constitutional items as education, welfare, urban problems, food programs, minority-group business ventures, and employment. He has a tendency toward obscuration about such matters as wage and price controls, the price of gold, anti-trust laws, and deficit spending; both liberals and conservatives can, from time to time, take satisfaction from his approach to these problems. But the most important key to Burns' approach to the federal government is that he favors a paternalistic federal government (this satisfies his "liberal" admirers) but insists that such a system be well-managed (this attracts "conservative" admirers).

As President Nixon's resident intellectual, Burns drafted the Administration's proposal to abolish the Electoral College. He is a civil rights addict and has expressed his exasperation with what he alleges has been lack of enforcement by the Justice Department of civil rights laws. He has raised the liberals' bogey of a military-industrial complex, which he blames for much of the nation's economic woes. He is a harsh critic of United States participation in the Vietnam War.

Away from academic and governmental duties, Burns has shown a proclivity for liberal-leftist associations. He has been a trustee of the Twentieth Century Fund, which from its inception has been a financial boon to leftwingers and leftwing causes. He has been a trustee of Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism with a membership of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist-fronters, and an occasional innocent. He has been a member of the one-world Pilgrim Society. He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a member of the leftwing-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union. He describes himself as a Moderate Republican.

EDWIN A. BURTT was born on October 11, 1892 in Groton, Massachusetts, son of Harriet Jerome and Edwin Burtt. He was married to and divorced from Mildred Camp. He is married to Marjorie Murray. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1915), Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1920; S.T.M., 1922), and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1925). He is the author of *The Metaphysical Foundations of Modern Physical Science* (1925); *Religion in an Age of Science* (1929); *Types of Religious Philosophy* (1939); *Right Thinking* (1946); *Man Seeks the Divine* (1957); and *In Search of Philosophic Understanding* (1965).

From 1921 until 1923, he was a philosophy instructor at Columbia University. From 1923 until 1931, he was at the University of Chicago: as philosophy instructor (1923-1924); assistant professor (1924-1927); and professor (1928-1931). From 1931 until 1960, he was a philosophy professor at Cornell University. He has been a visiting lecturer at Harvard University, Stanford University, the University of Hawaii, and the University of Calcutta.

Burtt has been affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges ("subversive"); American Friends of Spanish Democracy ("subversive"); the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace ("Communist front"); the Council for Pan-American Democracy ("subversive and Communist" – "Communist front"); the Stockholm Peace Appeal ("Communist Party campaign"); and defense campaigns for Communists William Schneiderman and Morris Schappes. In recent years Burtt has been active among academic peaceniks in opposition to U.S. participation in the Vietnam War.

ALLAN M. BUTLER was born on April 3, 1894 in Yonkers, New York, son of Ellen Mudge and George Butler. He married Mabel Churchill. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (Litt.B., 1916) and Harvard University (M.D., 1926).

From 1926 until 1928, Butler was a research assistant with the Rockefeller Institute. From 1928 until 1930, he was a tutor in biochemical sciences at Harvard University. From 1930 until 1960, he was on the staff of Harvard Medical School's department of pediatrics. From 1942 until 1960, he held the rank of professor of pediatrics at Harvard, and in 1960 became professor emeritus. He has served as chief of the children's medical service at Massachusetts General Hospital. From 1960 until 1962, he was director of medical clinics and chief of the pediatric service in Detroit's Metropolitan Hospital Clinics. In 1962 and 1963, he was a special consultant to California's Department of Public

Health. From 1963 until 1966, he was a lecturer at Stanford University's Medical School. In 1964 and 1965, he was a consultant to the Department of State's Agency for International Development. In 1965 and 1966, he was director of medical education at St. Luke's Hospital in San Francisco. From 1965 until 1969, he was a medical consultant to the Headstart program of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Butler has had a long career of leftwing affiliations. He was a member of China Welfare Appeal ("subversive"); co-chairman of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); a member of the National Reception Committee for Madame Irène Joliot-Curie, wife of the French Communist nuclear scientist, whose visit to the United States was sponsored by the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade ("Communist front"); a sponsor of the Call to a Bill of Rights Conference to conduct a fight for the twelve Communist defendants in the Smith Act cases of 1949; a signer of a brief, submitted to the Supreme Court, on behalf of John Howard Lawson and Dalton Trumbo, who had been convicted for contempt of Congress when they refused to either affirm or deny Communist Party membership; a member of the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); a member of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (ultra-leftwing, pacifist); a member of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "One of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); a member of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); a member of the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("Communist front" – "subversive"); an affiliate of the Progressive Citizens of America ("subversive"); a sponsor of the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); a sponsor of the World Peace Congress, 1949 ("Communist front"); a sponsor of the World Peace Congress, 1950 ("Communist front"); a sponsor of World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); a sponsor of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); a member of the Committee of Welcome for the "Red" Dean of Canterbury (a pro-Communist project); and a member of the Southern Conference Education Fund (the financial backbone of racial agitators, including the "black power" revolutionaries).

In 1966 and 1967, Butler was a fellow at the ultra-leftwing Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. In 1960, he was chairman of Physician's Forum, which was established in 1939, primarily by the Communist Party. The Forum's two aims were: (1) nationalization of medicine through the Social Security system; (2) the compulsory inclusion of physicians in a nationalized system of medicine under Social Security. In 1960, as chairman of the

Forum, Butler used the letters-to-the-editor page of the *New York Times* to promote the Forum's twenty-one-year-old program: "The social security system is the only financially and administratively sound mechanism to enable all our people to prepay during their working years the costs of the medical care they will need in their old age."

In 1969, at the age of seventy-five, Butler was called upon by the U.S. Public Health Service to direct a survey to discover "pockets of hunger" in New York City. The project was merely another socialist gimmick, but it rated a front-page story by Homer Bigart in the *New York Times.* Bigart, at least, saw the truth behind Butler's well-publicized survey. It was, said Bigart, based on "a *suspicion* that hidden pockets of hunger exist in the slums, unreached by public health nurses and social workers, and that children there go hungry because mothers are ignorant of relief facilities available, or perhaps too negligent to take the children to a clinic." Even Butler admitted that he did not expect to find anything startling in the survey, but such an intrusion of the federal government into "suspected" health problems was a cause long dear to his heart.

BENJAMIN J. BUTTENWIESER was born on October 22, 1900 in New York City, son of Caroline Weil and Joseph Buttenwieser. He married Helen Lehman. He is an alumnus of Columbia University.

Buttenwieser is a limited partner in the investment banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb and Company. He holds directorships in Title Guarantee Company of New York, Chock Full O' Nuts, Tishman Realty and Construction Company, and Revlon Incorporated. He is a trustee of Columbia University and Fisk University. He was assistant U.S. High Commissioner of Germany during the American occupation.

Buttenwieser is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has long been an official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He has been an official of the World Affairs Council, an offshoot of the Foreign Policy Association – which is a pivotal agency in a complex of one-world, leftist, and pacifist groups serving as a major propaganda arm for the United Nations. He has been a member of the Public Policy Committee of the Advertising Council, which uses business firms' money to tout pet left-wing projects of the federal government. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. In 1961, he petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, two Red-liners convicted of contempt of Congress. In 1962, he joined his wife in petitioning for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (Mrs. Buttenwieser, a lawyer, was a close friend and generous patron of Alger Hiss, a relationship that was especially noticeable during the period when Hiss was being convicted of perjury with relation to his Communist Party activities. Mrs. Buttenwieser's affinity for Soviet agents was also evident in 1962, when she provided $60,000 bail for the convicted Soviet spy Robert Soblen. She explained that she was interested in civil liberties and was sorry that defendants in unpopular causes – such as Soviet espionage – were unable to get bondsmen to post bail.)

HENRY B. CABOT was born on December 7, 1894 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Anne Codman and Henry Cabot. He married Olivia Ames. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1917; LL.B., 1922).

From 1922 until 1930, Cabot practiced law in Boston. From 1930 until 1938, he was a research associate at Harvard University's Law School. Since 1938, he has been a director of Samuel Cabot Incorporated.

Cabot has been on the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been a member of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee. He has been on the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist International Movement for Atlantic Union. He has been a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a sponsor of the NAACP's Legal Defense and Education Fund, the legal arm of racial agitators in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality, and the Student Nonviolent (National) Coordinating Committee.

THOMAS D. CABOT was born on May 1, 1897 in Cambridge, Massachusetts, son of Maria Moors and Godfrey Cabot. He married Virginia Wellington. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1919).

Since 1920, Cabot has held executive positions in his family's firm, Godfrey L. Cabot Incorporated (now the Cabot Corporation), and since 1960, he has been chairman of the board. He has held executive offices or directorships in United Fruit Company, the First National Bank of Boston, Plymouth Cordage, Carbon Black Export Incorporated, and John Hancock Insurance. He has been a trustee of Radcliffe College, a member of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Corporation, and a member of Harvard University's board of overseers. In 1951, he was director of the Department of State's office of internal security affairs.

Cabot is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been affiliated with Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent. He has been a sponsor of the World Affairs Council, a pivotal agency in a complex of one-world, leftist, and pacifist groups, which became a major propaganda arm for the United Nations. He has been a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy.

CASS CANFIELD was born on April 26, 1897 in New York City, son of Josephine Houghteling and August Canfield. He was married to and divorced from Katharine Emmet. His second wife is Jane White. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1919). In 1919 and 1920, he studied at Oxford University. He is the author of *The Publishing Experience* (1969).

In 1921 and 1922, Canfield was a securities analyst with Harris, Forbes and Company. In 1922 and 1923, he was a reporter for the *New York Evening Post.* In 1923 and 1924, he aided in the establishment of *Foreign Affairs,* the quarterly journal of the Council on Foreign Relations. From 1924 until 1962, he was with the book publishing firm of Harper and Brothers: as manager of Harper's London office (1924-1927); assistant book editor (1927-1929); executive vice president (1929-1931); president (1931-1945); chairman of the board (1945-1955); and chairman of the executive committee and editorial board (1955-1962). From 1962 until 1967, he was chairman of the executive committee and editorial board of Harper and Row. He also served as vice chairman of Harper's Magazine Incorporated. In 1942 and 1943, he was chief of the blockade and supply branch of the Board of Economic Warfare. In 1944, he was a special consultant to the Foreign Economic Administration. In 1945, he was director of the Red-lined Office of War Information.

Canfield has been affiliated with the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief ("subversive and Communist"); the Churchman Associates, a leftwing group in support of pro-Soviet propaganda; the leftist-pacifist Hiroshima House Foundation; the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a group which, since 1948, has campaigned for and financed ultra-leftist candidates for the House and Senate; Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation; and the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee, the International Movement for Atlantic Union, the American Association for the United Nations, and the United World Federalists. For more than twenty years, he has been a resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He was an original sponsor of the Socialist-oriented Public Affairs Institute. He was a member of the Freedom House Bookshelf Committee, a group of leftists who selected and distributed books by leftists to enlighten leaders and scholars in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

JAY HENRY CERF was born on May 17, 1923 in Chicago, son of Blanche Ruth and Nathan Cerf. He married Carol McGovern. He is an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1948; M.A., 1951) and Yale University (M.A., 1952; Ph.D., 1957). He pursued postgraduate studies at the University of Heidelberg (1949) and was a Fulbright scholar at Berlin's Free University in 1953 and 1954. He was a teaching fellow at Yale University in 1952 and 1953, and a Penfield fellow at the University of Pennsylvania in 1956.

Cerf is the author of *The Intellectual Basis of Nazism* (1951) and *History of the Free University* (1954). He has edited *Strategy for the 60's* (1961); *The Alliance for Progress – A Hemispheric Response to a Global Threat* (1965); and *A Strategic Doctrine of East-West Trade.*

From 1949 until 1951, Cerf was a research analyst for the federal government. In 1955 and 1956, he was a legislative assistant in the Congress. From 1957 until 1961, he was the director of the now-defunct Foreign Policy Clearing House. In 1961, he was a special assistant to Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges. In 1961 and 1962, he was a deputy assistant for international affairs to the Secretary of Commerce.

Since 1962, Cerf has been employed by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States as manager of the Chamber's foreign commerce-foreign policy department. In this position, he worked to bring the Chamber's policy into line with Lyndon Johnson's policy of building trade bridges between the United States and the Soviet Union and its Eastern Europe satellites.

He has aired his views on trading with the Communist bloc in, among other places, the *New York Times Magazine* ("We Should Do More Business With The Communists," December 5, 1965). In this article he argued that, since our free world allies trade with the Communist bloc, we should too, because if the Communists do not get what they want in trade with the United States they will shop elsewhere. As part of his rationalization, Cerf insisted that such countries as Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Poland were not a part of the Soviet monolith but rather were virtually independent in setting their own trade policies.

As is the wont of liberals, Cerf advanced the thesis that there is a discernible distinction between strategic and nonstrategic goods, and that the latter should be traded without restriction to the Communist bloc. (By design or otherwise, Cerf never admits that throughout the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations the Department of Commerce inflated the nonstrategic category to such an extent that the strategic category virtually disappeared.)

As for those who opposed East-West trade on grounds that it was senseless and/oı immoral to trade with the enemy (especially with the war in Vietnam being made possible by that enemy), Cerf charged that they were guilty of "neo-patriotic rhetoric." Yet in his own business-as-usual rhetoric, Cerf insisted that "our East-West trade policy, in truth, reflects a national attitude based more on current wishing than on current events." At no time did he admit that the Vietnam War was a current event made possible by the material sent to Vietnam by the Soviet Union and the rest of the Communist bloc.

JAMES C. CHARLESWORTH was born on May 21, 1900 in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, son of Priscilla Hawkins and James Charlesworth. He was married to the late Dorothy Coy. His second wife is Berenice Steward. From 1919 until 1923, he attended the Carnegie Institute of Technology. He is an alumnus of the University of Pittsburgh (A.B., 1926; A.M., 1927; Ph.D., 1932). He is the author of *Governmental Administration* (1951) and *Governmental Reorganization of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania* (1957). For the leftist-oriented American Academy of Political and Social Science, he has edited *Meaning of the 1952 Presidential Election* (1952); *America and a New Asia* (1954); *Bureaucracy and Democratic Government* (1954); *The Future of the Western Alliance* (1957); *Asia and Future World Leadership* (1958); *American Civilization and Its Leadership Needs: 1960-1990* (1959); *Resolving the Russian-American Deadlock* (1959); *Whither American Foreign Policy?* (1960); *Is International Communism Winning?* (1961); *American Foreign Policy Challenged* (1962); *Behavioralism in Political Science* (1962); *Mathematics and the Social Sciences* (1963); *Leisure in America* (1964); *Africa in Motion* (1964); *Ethics in America: Norms and Deviations* (1966); *A Design for Political Science* (1966); *The Changing American People: Are We Deteriorating or Improving?* (1968); and *The Theory and Practice of Public Administration* (1968).

From 1926 until 1939, Charlesworth was at the University of Pittsburgh: as instructor (1926-1933); assistant professor of political science (1933-1935); and associate professor and supervisor of the government service course (1935-1939). Since 1939, he has been at the University of Pennsylvania: as director of educational program in the institute of local and state government (1939-1955); director of the graduate division in the Wharton School of Finance (1942-1943); associate professor of political science (1939-1945); and, since 1945, professor of political science. In 1955 and 1956, he was secretary of administration for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Since 1953, he has been president of the leftist-oriented American Academy of Political and Social Science.

Charlesworth has been an official in Clarence Streit's leftist-internationalist complex: Federal Union and the International Movement for Atlantic Union. He has been a long-time member of the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists.

ABRAM CHAYES was born on July 18, 1922 in Chicago, son of Kitty Torch and Edward Chayes. He married Antonia Handler. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1943; LL.B., 1949). He has been admitted to the bar in Connecticut (1950), the District of Columbia (1953), and Massachusetts (1958).

In 1949 and 1950, Chayes was a legal advisor to Connecticut's ultra-liberal Governor, Chester Bowles. In 1951 and 1952, he was a law clerk for the ultra-leftist Felix Frankfurter, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. From 1952 until 1955, he engaged in private law practice in Washington, D.C. From 1955 until 1961, he was an associate professor and professor of law at Harvard University's Law School.

In 1956, Chayes and his wife joined the Kennedys' political dynasty during the Democratic National Convention. In the 1960 presidential campaign, Chayes was staff director for the Democratic Platform Committee and a speech writer for John F. Kennedy. In 1961, he was appointed Legal Adviser to the Department of State.

While in the State Department, Chayes played a major role (along with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Under Secretary of State George Ball) in the vendetta waged against Otto Otepka, the Security Officer whose security-consciousness was anathema to the entrenched liberal-leftist bloc in the Department.

In the same period during which Otepka was being railroaded out of the State Department, Chayes labored effectively to make it easier for American Communists to travel abroad. Despite the strenuous opposition of the security-conscious director of the Passport Office, Frances Knight, Chayes was able to bring about a relaxation of passport and visa restrictions.

In 1964, Chayes resigned his position as Legal Advisor and became a consultant to the Presidential Economic Task Force. In 1964 and 1965, he returned to private law practice. In 1965 and 1966, he received a Carnegie Corporation reflective-year grant. Since 1965, he has been a professor of law at Harvard. He returned briefly to the political scene in 1968 as a leader (with Adam Yarmolinsky) of a Harvard group working in the late Robert Kennedy's campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination.

SHIRLEY CHISOLM was born on November 30, 1924 in Brooklyn, New York, daughter of Ruby Seale and Charles St. Hill. She married Conrad Chisolm. She is an alumna of Brooklyn College (B.A., 1946) and Columbia University (M.A., 1952).

From 1946 until 1953, Shirley Chisolm was a nursery school teacher and director. From 1953 until 1959, she was director of a child care center. From 1959 until 1964, she was an educational consultant to New York City's Division of Child Care.

From 1964 until 1968, Shirley Chisolm was a member of New York's State Assembly. As an Assemblywoman she worked strenuously to promote socialistic measures sponsoring day-care centers, all-day kindergartens, slum insurance pools, minimum wage laws, and legislation that would allow college matriculation for Negroes and Puerto Ricans who are not scholastically qualified.

In 1968, Shirley Chisolm became the Democratic National Committeewoman from New York. In that same year, she was selected to be a candidate for the House of Representatives by a special committee organized to elect a black to Congress from Brooklyn. In a bitterly fought contest, she defeated James Farmer, leader of the Congress for Racial Equality and the nominee of the Republican and Liberal parties. She thus became the first Negro woman elected to Congress. (In the June 1969 issue of *Political Affairs,* old-time Communist Hosea Hudson boasted of how he was on the committee that chose Shirley Chisolm as its congressional candidate, and how he worked for her victory.)

In 1969, Shirley Chisolm jumped the political fence and endorsed Republican John Lindsay in New York City's mayoralty race. The defection from the Democrats was only temporary. In the Congress, she joined the ultra-left New Democratic Coalition, which included some of her most radical colleagues: Don Edwards, Andrew Jacobs, and George E. Brown Jr. of California; Benjamin Rosenthal, William Fitts Ryan, Allard Lowenstein, James H. Scheuer, and Jonathan Bingham of New York; Donald Fraser of Minnesota; John Conyers of Michigan; and Robert Kastenmeier of Wisconsin. Non-congressional members of the Coalition included radicals such as Michael Harrington, Channing Phillips, and Don Rothenberg. Among the aims of the Coalition has been the organization of "a constructive radicalism on our campuses" and support for anti-Viet Nam War demonstrations.

Early in her congressional career, Shirley Chisolm postured as a moderate: "There is no room in our society for black extremists or white extremists, but this, unfortunately, is characteristic of a revolution. O, my white constituents were terrified about having a black person represent them. But, they are part of my constituency and I will work for them. America is still a multi-facet society. We've got to learn to live together." After a year in the Congress, however, she no longer disguised her flair for black racism or her admiration for such extremists as Malcolm X and Eldridge Cleaver.

In an address at the Berkeley campus of the University of California in January 1970, Shirley Chisolm said that where she had once been a moderate, she was now a militant. In a virtual call for a black revolution, she stated: "Black people are tired of tokenism and gradualism and want a piece of the pie now." Responding to the revolutionaries' cries of "Right On," she said: "Blacks, Mexican-Americans, and Indians can be a coalition of forces that did not exist before. What is shaping up is a struggle between the haves and have-nots. It is a needed alliance. And something good can come out of the development of black caucuses."

There was a time when Shirley Chisolm's leftism was expressed through her affiliations with such organizations as the NAACP and the League of Women Voters. Now she utters sentiments usually expressed by Black Panthers and is not averse to brandishing the clenched-fist salute, an old symbol of Communism and more recently of revolutionary black power.

[AVRAM] NOAM CHOMSKY was born on December 7, 1928 in Philadelphia, son of Elsie Simonofsky and William Chomsky. He married Carol Schatz. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (B.A., 1949; M.A., 1951; Ph.D., 1955).

Since 1955, Chomsky has been on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as an assistant professor (1955-1958), associate professor (1958-1962), and, since 1962, professor of linguistics. In 1957 and 1958, he was a visiting professor at Columbia University. In 1958 and 1959, he was a member of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey. In 1967, he was a visiting professor at the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1967 and 1968, he was a visiting professor at the University of California at Berkeley. From 1951 until 1955, he was a junior fellow of Harvard University's Society of Fellows, and from 1964 until 1967, a research fellow in the Cognitive Studies Center.

Chomsky signed an open letter to President Kennedy in opposition to an anti-Communist invasion of Castro's Cuba. He sponsored the Emergency Committee for Disaster Relief to Cuba, an organization dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. He signed an advertisement urging abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities; this was part of the anti-HCUA campaign waged by the National Committee to Abolish HUAC ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"). He signed a clemency petition for the convicted and imprisoned Communists, Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden. He opposed an investigation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities of the Communist-dominated Medical Aid to Cuba Committee. In 1968, he participated in the New University Conference, a group of radical "intellectuals."

Chomsky, who has avoided any service in the armed forces, has been an active peacenik in recent years. In 1967, he supported the Spring Mobilization Committee which was dominated by Communists and fellow travelers. In 1967, he supported the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, on behalf of three soldiers who sought to evade service in Vietnam. In 1969, he was one of the first academicians to support student boycotts of classes on behalf of the leftwing, peacenik Vietnam Moratorium Committee.

WALKER L. CISLER was born on October 8, 1897 in Marietta, Ohio, son of Sara Walker and Louis Cisler. He married Gertrude Rippe. He is an alumnus of Cornell University (M.E., 1922).

From 1922 until 1941, Cisler was with the Public Service Electric & Gas Company of Newark, New Jersey. He held various engineering positions ranging from cadet engineer (1922-1924) to assistant chief engineer (1938-1941). From 1941 until 1943, he worked for the War Production Board in Washington, D.C. From 1943 until 1945, as an army lieutenant colonel and colonel, he was, successively, chief of the public utilities section of SHAEF and of the Office of Military Government for Germany. Since 1945, he has been with

Detroit Edison Company: chief engineer of power plants (1945-1947); executive vice president (1948-1951); president (1961-1964); and, since 1964, chairman of the board and chief executive officer. He is chairman of the board of Freuhauf Corporation and president of Power Reactor Development Company and Atomic Power Development Associations. He has been a consultant to the U.S. Army, the Department of State, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Security Resources Board, and the International Cooperation Administration.

Cisler is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a one-world group. He has been a member of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Council, virtually the patronage link between the Council on Foreign Relations and the federal government. He is a member of the leftist-globalist Atlantic Union Committee.

EVANS CLARK was born on August 9, 1888 in Orange, New Jersey, son of Fanny Cox and William Clark. He married Freda Kirchwey, who became one of America's most successful leftwing publishers (*Nation* magazine) and an inveterate joiner of Communist fronts. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (B.A., 1910) and Columbia University (M.A., 1913). He is the author of *Financing the Consumer* and *How to Budget Health* and co-author of *State Socialism, Boycotts and Peace, The Internal Debts of the United States,* and *Stock Market Control.*

From 1914 until 1917, Clark was an instructor in government at Princeton University. In 1917, he was research director for the Socialist members of New York City's board of aldermen. From 1917 until 1919, he was an associate editor of *The Utilities* Magazine, a trade publication. In 1919, he worked for a Russian "trade" bureau as secretary to Ludwig Martens, one of the first Communists deported to Soviet Russia by the United States Government.

In 1920, Clark was a co-organizer of Labor Bureau, Inc., an advisory group for labor unions, and until 1924, he was managing director of the bureau. From 1924 until 1928, he was in journalism with the *New York Call, Advertisers' Weekly,* and *New York Times.*

In 1928, Clark began a twenty-five-year career as executive director of the Twentieth Century Fund, which throughout its history has been a financial boon to leftwing researchers in the fields of economics, political science, and sociology. (Since 1953, Clark has been a member of the Fund's board of trustees.)

From 1954 until 1962, Clark was a member of the editorial board of the *New York Times.* (Since 1962, he has been an editorial contributor to the *Times.*)

In 1935, Clark became a co-founder and member of the Public Affairs Committee which, under the aegis of Maxwell Stewart, became a very important pro-Communist propaganda outlet through its Public Affairs Pamphlets.

Clark found many outlets which were useful in the promotion of his leftwing views. In 1940, he was a founder of the Council for Democracy, a coordinating center for leftwing groups interested in propagandizing for United States intervention in World War II. When the war was over, the Council concentrated upon racial agitation and also became a propaganda front for the United Nations. The Council, under Clark's leadership, hoped to achieve world government by increasing the powers of the United Nations.

In 1944, Clark organized the Postwar Information Exchange as a clearinghouse and coordination center for dogooders of the socialist stamp who were interested in planning for a postwar American society. (Clark was especially interested in promoting socialist measures in the fields of medicine and public housing.) In the postwar period, Clark's group changed its name to Program Information Exchange and did a great deal to publicize such leftwing organizations as the League of Women Voters, the Foreign Policy Association, and the CIO's Political Action Committee.

From 1945 until 1960, Clark served as an official of the public policy committee of The Advertising Council (director, 1945-1960; chairman, 1946-1950; vice-chairman from 1950 onward). The Advertising Council, utilizing the talents of advertising professionals and the finances of the American business community, has worked strenuously for welfare statism and a leftwing internationalist foreign policy.

Clark has been affiliated with the Council for Pan-American Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives ("Communist-controlled"); the American Investors' Union ("Communist front"); the Consumers National Federation ("Communist front"); the Committee for a Boycott against Japanese Aggression ("Communist front"); the American Institute of Pacific Relations ("a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far-eastern policies toward Communist objectives"); the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States); the League for Industrial Democracy (Socialist); and the National Committee for an Effective Congress (an ultra-leftwing political pressure group).

ELDRIDGE CLEAVER was born in 1935 in Wabbaseka, Arkansas, son of Leroy and Thelma Cleaver. He married Kathleen Neal.

Cleaver spent most of his teen-age years in various reform schools in California. At the age of eighteen, he was convicted of possession of marijuana, which he had been using for four or five years. He began serving his prison sentence on June 18, 1954. (Later, he wrote: "My mistress at the time of my arrest, the beautiful and lovely wife of a serviceman stationed overseas, died unexpectedly three weeks after I entered prison . . . . ")

When Cleaver was paroled from prison, he enjoyed freedom for only eleven months. Of those months, he later wrote: "I became a rapist. To refine my techniques and *modus operandi,* I started out by practicing on black girls in the ghetto . . . and when I considered myself smooth enough, I crossed the tracks and sought out white prey. I did this consciously, deliberately, wilfully, methodically . . . . Rape was an insurrectionary act. It delighted me that I was defying and trampling upon the white man's law, upon his system of values, and that I was defiling his women . . . . "

In 1958, Cleaver was convicted of assault with intent to kill and rape. He began serving a two-to-fourteen-year sentence at San Quentin prison. In 1963, he was transferred from San Quentin to

Folsom Prison because he was an agitator. In December 1966, through the intervention of an ultra-leftist attorney, Beverly Axelrod, Cleaver was paroled from Folsom after nine consecutive years of imprisonment.

Twelve months after his release from Folsom, McGraw-Hill published Cleaver's *Soul on Ice,* autobiographical essays that purported to have been written in great part while Cleaver was in prison. (Maxwell Geismar wrote an introduction to *Soul on Ice.* He described Cleaver as "simply one of the best cultural critics now writing." In his book, Cleaver thanks Edward M. Keating, publisher and editor-in-chief of the ultra-leftist *Ramparts* magazine, for his help in getting *Soul on Ice* published. Keating was introduced to Cleaver by Beverly Axelrod. When Cleaver left prison, he went on *Ramparts'* payroll and he has been described at various times as a senior, international, foreign, assistant, and roving international editor.) (" . . . Keating . . . recalls meeting Miss Axelrod at an anti-Vietnam war rally in the summer of 1965. 'I've got a client who's a would-be writer,' she said, and she handed Keating a pile of manuscript 'about an inch and a half high' to read over the weekend. He found the writing flawed but impressive, and suggested that Miss Axelrod bring her client around for an editorial discussion. 'That won't be so easy,' she replied. 'He's in Folsom prison.' Keating, himself a lawyer and the first editor to work with Cleaver, went to Folsom to meet him. 'I thought him a very powerful writer, and I was curious as to what he'd be like.' Keating cared enough to send some of it [Cleaver's writings] East, to Maxwell Geismar, Thomas Merton, Norman Mailer and John Howard Griffin. Their enthusiastic response was transmitted to the authorities, but it was not until November [i.e., December] 1966 that Cleaver was paroled. By then he had already written most of the pieces – social commentary, letters, polemics – which were to make him a national figure when gathered together in 'Soul on Ice.' " Harvey Swados, "Old Con, Black Panther, Brilliant Writer and Quintessential American," *New York Times Magazine,* September 7, 1969.)

In *Soul on Ice,* Cleaver recounts his experiences at self-education in prison. He claims to have studied Thomas Paine, Voltaire, Rousseau, Marx, Lenin, Frantz Fanon, and others. Eventually he settled for leftism: "In economics, because everybody seemed to find it necessary to attack and condemn Karl Marx in their writings, I sought out his books, and although he kept me with a headache, I took him for my authority. I was not prepared to understand him, but I was able to see in him a thoroughgoing critique and condemnation of capitalism. It was like taking medicine for me to find that, indeed, American capitalism deserved all the hatred and contempt that I felt for it in my heart." – " . . . I fell in love with Bakunin and Nechayev's *Catechism of the Revolutionist* – the principles of which, along with some of Machiavelli's advice, I sought to incorporate into my own behavior. I took the *Catechism* for my bible and, standing on a one-man platform that had nothing to do with the reconstruction of society, I began consciously incorporating these principles into my daily life, to employ tactics of ruthlessness in my dealings with everyone with whom I came into contact. And I began to look at white America through these new eyes."

In his studies, Cleaver acquired an impressive roster of heroes and villains. Aside from Marx, Bakunin, and

Nechayev, Cleaver admired Mao Tse-tung, Malcolm X, Robert Williams, Lenin, Fidel Castro, Eugene Debs, Ché Guevara, W.E.B. DuBois, Jomo Kenyatta, Albert Luthuli, Paul Robeson, Cassius Clay, Richard Wright, Huey Newton, and Bobby Seale. His villains included the late Joe McCarthy, the military, the police, the FBI, whites (except those who are useful to him), and peaceable Negroes, whom he characterizes as "Uncle Toms."

While in prison, Cleaver became a member of the Nation of Islam – Elijah Muhammad's Black Muslims. When factionalism rent Islam, Cleaver became a devotee of Malcolm X, who formed his own Muslim group – the Organization of Afro-American Unity. Cleaver insisted that he was a Muslim preacher and entitled to special privileges in prison. (Incredibly, when Robert Coles reviewed *Soul on Ice* for *Atlantic Monthly,* he wrote of Muslim Cleaver: "He is full of Christian care, Christian grief and disappointment, Christian resignation, Christian messianic toughness, and hope.")

After Cleaver left prison in 1966, he established a Black House in San Francisco. He tried but failed to revive Malcolm X's Organization of Afro-American Unity. He then turned to the Black Panther Party, a terroristic group which had been organized in 1966 by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale. Cleaver became the Panthers' Minister of Information.

It was only natural that Cleaver would be attracted to the Panthers, who adopted their motto from one of Cleaver's heroes, Mao Tse-tung: "We are advocates of the abolition of war; we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war; and in order to get rid of a gun it is necessary to pick up the gun."

The Panthers' racist, anti-American platform was bound to be appealing to Cleaver: "(1.) We want freedom. We want power to determine the destiny of our Black Community. (2.) We want full employment for our people. (3.) We want an end to the robbery by the white man of our Black Community. (4.) We want decent housing, fit for shelter of human beings. (5.) We want education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society. We want education that teaches us our true history and our role in the present-day society. (6.) We want all black men to be exempt from military service. (7.) We want an immediate end to police brutality and murder of black people. (8.) We want freedom for all black men held in federal, state, county and city prisons and jails. (9.) We want all black people when brought to trial to be tried in court by a jury of their peer group or people from their black communities, as defined by the Constitution of the United States. (10.) We want land, bread, housing, education, clothing, justice and peace. And as our major political objective, a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate, for the purpose of determining the will of black people as to their national destiny." (On October 11, 1968, Cleaver added an eleventh point to the platform: "A call for a United Nations supervised plebiscite to be held throughout black communities of this country allowing black people to go on record with the democratic expression of their will as to whether or not they want to be integrated into this country, whether or not they want to be separated and have this country partitioned into a land of their own.")

The program that supports the Panthers' platform is an outrageous blend of racism, phony pacifism, and especially Marxism. In one of his exhortations as the Panthers' Minister of Information, Cleaver said: "Let's pay our respects to Brother Karl Marx's gigantic brain, using the fruits of his wisdom, applying them to this crumbling system, and have some socialism, moving on to the classless society. You call it communism."

Beginning in February 1967, when he became a Black Panther, Cleaver was an enthusiastic activist for the group. In March 1967, he carried the Panthers' message of hate to a conference of Negro students at Fisk University. (The conference was organized by Kathleen Neal, a college drop-out who had worked for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and for the public relations department of the Peace Corps. She and Cleaver were married in December 1967. She became Communications Secretary for the Panthers.)

In April 1967, Cleaver was a featured speaker at an anti-Vietnam War rally, attended by 65,000, in San Francisco's Kezar Stadium. (Cleaver has been especially solicitous of the Communists in Vietnam. In October 1968, he said of the Panthers: "We want solidarity with Ho chi Minh, solidarity with the people, the Viet Cong, the Liberation fighters in Vietnam.")

In May 1967, Cleaver was on the scene as a "reporter" for *Ramparts* magazine when a horde of Black Panthers carried out an invasion of the California legislature's chambers. Armed with loaded shotguns, rifles, and pistols, they intended to intimidate the legislators. Cleaver was arrested at the time, but was released when he pleaded that he had been present only as an observing journalist.

By 1968, Cleaver was the leading spokesman of the Black Panthers. Huey Newton was in prison, convicted of voluntary manslaughter in the death of a policeman. Bobby Seale was on restrictive probation for violating gun laws. Cleaver was making public speeches in a campaign "to free Huey." He was also the editor of the Black Panther Party's newspaper, the content of which was directed in most part against the police – the "pigs," in Cleaver's language. And Cleaver left little to the imagination when he ranted: "From now on, we niggers have got to stop killing other niggers and start killing police."

In February 1968, Cleaver appeared at a Peace and Freedom Rally in the Oakland Auditorium. He shared the speakers' platform with such racist agitators as Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, and James Forman, who used the occasion to announce the merger of the Black Panthers with Forman's Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Also in February 1968, Cleaver's *Soul on Ice* was published. He became a national celebrity when the leftwing reviewers touted the book onto the best sellers' lists. Syrupy praise was lavished on *Soul on Ice,* even though its superficial reflections on war, religion, sociology, history, and philosophy reeked with vulgarity, obscenity, and scatology. For his part, Cleaver traveled around the country promoting his book.

In April 1968, Cleaver was involved in a shooting duel with police in Oakland, California. A companion of Cleaver's was killed. Cleaver was arrested, his parole was revoked, and he was sent to Vacaville Prison. While in prison, Cleaver announced his candidacy for the presidency of the United States on the ticket of the Communist-dominated Peace and Freedom Party, with which the Panthers had allied themselves in December 1967.

In June 1968, an old-time Communist attorney, Charles Garry, secured Cleaver's release from Vacaville – on $50,000 bail – with a writ of habeas corpus. Garry pleaded that Cleaver was a political prisoner, and a superior court judge in California overruled the revocation of Cleaver's parole. In September 1968, California's Court of Appeals overturned the superior court decision and ordered that Cleaver return to prison on November 27, 1968. (After Cleaver was released from Vacaville, the Xerox Corporation invited him to its Rochester, New York facilities to lecture to young trainees. Cleaver took advantage of the situation by presenting an obscene tirade. He turned the encounter into a propaganda pitch for the Black Panther Party and the Peace and Freedom Party. Directing his remarks to his hosts, Cleaver said: "Maybe we'll come and burn [Rochester] down, or we'll go down to Xerox and blow it up." The trainees at Xerox laughed and cheered.)

Meanwhile, Cleaver was conducting his presidential campaign. In August 1968, he received the nomination at the national convention of the Peace and Freedom Party. (His wife, Kathleen, and Huey Newton were Peace and Freedom candidates for California's legislature and the U.S. Congress, respectively.) Tom Hayden, a founder of the Students for a Democratic Society, was Cleaver's campaign manager. (Eventually, Cleaver's name appeared on the ballot in Arizona, California, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, and Washington. He received a total of 36,385 votes – 27,707 of them from California.)

On August 2, 1968, at the University of Southern California, Cleaver delivered an address that he repeated the next day before the Peace and Freedom Party of California. With a contrived dialect, he harangued: "The pigs of the power structure say the people are impotent, that we can't control things anymore . . . . As long as there are people on this Earth they will always be able to take control of their own destiny and pull down the pigs of the power structure. They say, if you want a bad example, look to China. Well I ain't gonna look to China. I done looked to China. And I see Mao Tse-tung took up a gun, took the coolies away from the rickshaw, and now he's got the hydrogen bomb. And I say that's all right . . . .

"I'm not a freak for violence. Guns is ugly. People is what's beautiful, and when you use a gun to kill a person you doin' something that's ugly. But there are two forms of violence – violence to liberate yourself and violence visited on you to keep you in your place. We have to make a choice between continuing to be the victim, or decide to take our freedom . . . . There gonna be blood on the streets of Babylon [the United States]."

Cleaver's periodic disavowals of violence are as transparently ludicrous as his phony overtures to whites. His hatred for the United States calls for extreme violence, as he announced in April 1968: "Now there is the gun and the bomb, dynamite and the knife, and they will be used liberally in America. America will bleed. America will suffer." On other occasions, he has said: "We call for the violent overthrow of the fascist imperialist United States government, ringleaders of oppression and international aggression." – "We are going to fight and we will decimate this country. We will gut your industrial cities, and we will create conditions so that enemies can walk in here and pick the gold out of your *** teeth. We are going to move against this system . . . in harmony with Mao Tse-tung, with Ho chi Minh." To Cleaver, the United States is "the successor to Nazi Germany, the No. 1 obstacle to human progress, not Russia, not China, but Babylon, right here in North America." As for the whites, Cleaver gave his definitive statement in September 1968 to a group of young lawyers in San Francisco. He was asked what whites could do to help Negroes. He replied: "Kill some white people or make them act in a prescribed manner." A few weeks later, while speaking at New York University, Cleaver said: "We need a Boston Tea Party from one end of this country to the other. You'd better get ready, because the pigs are ready. And if whites are not yet ready, niggers are going to create a situation where you'll have no choice: you'll have to move for your liberation, or get into the pigpen with the oinks. Today, you're either part of the solution or part of the problem."

In the fall of 1968, Cleaver made frequent appearances on campuses, including Stanford University and the University of California at Berkeley. He was even invited by students and faculty on the Berkeley campus to present a ten-lecture experimental sociology course. Governor Ronald Reagan, the university's regents, tens of thousands of Californian taxpayers, and most of the state's legislators objected, but Cleaver did present one "lecture" before he was squelched.

In November 1968, a few days before Cleaver was scheduled to return to prison, he disappeared. On November 27, he became a bail-jumper and fugitive under California's laws. On December 10, 1968, a federal fugitive warrant was issued for his arrest, charging him with unlawful flight to avoid confinement. (In the meantime, in the week that Cleaver jumped bail, the International Committee to Defend Eldridge Cleaver was formed. In a full-page advertisement in the *New York Times,* funds were solicited by a group of leftists including James Baldwin; Daniel Berrigan, S.J.; Angus Cameron; Stokely Carmichael; Noam Chomsky; Ossie Davis; Maxwell Geismar; Andrew Kopkind; Dwight Macdonald; Norman Mailer; Mr. and Mrs. Burgess Meredith; Arthur Miller; Jack Newfield; George Plimpton; Victor Rabinowitz; Richard Rovere; Bertrand Russell; Robert Scheer; and Howard Zinn.)

When Cleaver jumped bail, he went to Cuba by way of Canada and Mexico. His presence in Cuba became public knowledge in May 1969, and on June 12 the State Department announced that Cleaver's financial assets in the United States (an estimated $500,000) were frozen because of his unauthorized travel to Cuba.

On July 17, 1969, Cleaver arrived in Algiers, with his wife and child, to attend the two-week Pan African Cultural Festival as a guest of the Algerian regime of Communist Houari Boumédienne.

In Algiers, Cleaver broke an eight-month silence and the press faithfully reported his anti-American fulminations: "I've traveled in eight countries . . . checking, and I've found Yankee Imperialism numbing people, starving them . . . . " – "The black people are fed up with oppression, with new lies. There are no new lies that will fool them, not even Nixon's lies of black capitalism. We [the Black Panthers] want to do away with capitalism altogether. Capitalism is oppression for us. Under it, we could be nothing better than slaves." – "[Nixon is] the number one pig, the spokesman for the power structure; and as such he oinks for all his barnyard fellows." –

"We [Black Panthers] have a war going on in the United States and the casualty rate is rising," and the capitalist system in the United States "must be dismantled over the dead bodies" of its supporters. – "If you look around the world, you will see that the only countries which have liberated themselves and managed to withstand the tide of counterrevolution are precisely those countries that have strong Marxist-Leninist parties." – "I intend to return to the U.S.A. If my lawyers cannot arrange for me to do this legally without risking incarceration without trial, I will just have to go in the same way I got out."

Don A. Schanche, formerly an executive editor of the *Saturday Evening Post,* spent two weeks in Algiers with Cleaver. Schanche, obviously an admirer of Cleaver, recounted his experiences in "Eldridge Cleaver Speaks from Exile," in *True* magazine (January, 1970). Schanche found Cleaver not lacking for company. With Cleaver and his family were three Black Panther lieutenants who had hijacked American airliners to Cuba. Cleaver has also been visited by Robert Scheer, editor of *Ramparts* magazine. *Ramparts* has published writings of Cleaver since he fled from the United States, and in 1969 Scheer edited and introduced Cleaver's *Post-Prison Writings and Speeches,* published by Random House.

Schanche has written that Cleaver – between his stay in Cuba and his arrival in Algiers – was in Czecho-Slovakia, Morocco, and Egypt. Cleaver told Schanche "of his plan to return in secret and go underground as part of a frightening tactic in leading a bloody new revolution." He talked freely to Schanche about the possibilities of assassinating President Nixon and members of Congress: "I have a real desire to pull some triggers. I am not saying that I want to get screwed up. I am saying that out there are a lot of targets that I actually want to aim at and I want to pull the trigger. At the same time I want to write, to undertake an analysis of the problems in Babylon [the United States]. That's the way to take a long-range shot at them, like shooting a thousand of them at once. It is not immediate though. I need them both."

Schanche thought Cleaver presented a "rather terrifying picture" when he confided: "I will go back to Babylon [the United States] at a time and in a way of my own choosing. The FBI won't find me. One of the tactics we are going to pursue, and it will be a very effective tactic, is to create underground sanctuaries all over the United States where people can flee. Whenever anyone faces arrest, he will resist arrest and go underground to a sanctuary. Prisoners who escape from the jails in Babylon will have these sanctuaries to go to. I will be in one of the sanctuaries. People escaping from the pigs will know that I am there and it will give them a sense of security when they come." Schanche admits that Cleaver's rhetoric causes some who hear and read him to sense that the Black Panthers' Minister of Information is somewhat paranoid.

In an interview, published on February 1, 1970, Cleaver told *Life* magazine's reporter Gordon Parks that the deaths of Black Panther leaders had to be avenged. "Violence? We hate it," Cleaver said. "But is it violent to shoot a cop who breaks into your home bent on killing you? If so, the Panthers are violent."

On February 23, 1970, several thousand leftwing students in Paris heard a fiery tape-recorded message from Cleaver, who was still in Algeria: "Now is the time for us to move into the streets, to cause destruction, to drag this decadent system [of capitalism] over the cliff." For the year 1970, Cleaver predicted "violence as a tactic raised to new levels, unprecedented levels . . . . We call for chaos inside the capitalist countries. Inside the United States, we will have war." Cleaver called the United States the No. 1 enemy of the world and said that President Nixon was "the head of the most savage warmongering circle . . . . The government of the United States of America has fallen into the hands of mad men."

EVERETT R. CLINCHY was born on December 16, 1896 in New York City, son of Lydie Stagg and James Clinchy. He married Winifred Mead. From 1916 until 1918, he was an undergraduate at Wesleyan University. He is an alumnus of Lafayette College (B.S., 1920) and Drew University (Ph.D., 1934). He also pursued graduate studies at Union Theological Seminary and Yale University. He was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church in 1921. He is the author of *All in the Name of God* (1934); *The World We Want to Live In* (1942); *A Handbook on Human Relations* (1949); *Intergroup Relations Center* (1950); and *Science and Human Responsibility* (1956).

From 1921 until 1923, Clinchy was pastor of the Fairmount (New Jersey) Presbyterian Church. From 1923 until 1928, he was pastor of the Church of Christ at Wesleyan University in Middletown, Connecticut. From 1928 until 1933, he was secretary of the Red-laden Federal Council of the Churches of Christ. From 1928 until 1958, he was president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ).

Beginning in 1950, Clinchy began a career as a one-man interlocking directorate of organizations that have promoted one-worldism, pacifism, and international socialism. In 1950, under the auspices of the NCCJ, World Brotherhood was founded at UNESCO House in Paris. Clinchy became president of World Brotherhood, which settled in its international headquarters at the national headquarters of the NCCJ in New York City. World Brotherhood eventually changed its name to the Council on World Tensions (CWT). Clinchy was president of the CWT. Meanwhile, Clinchy was vice president and executive director of the Roger Williams Straus Foundation, which provided very substantial financial help to the NCCJ and World Brotherhood. Clinchy was also vice president of the Oliver Wendell Holmes Foundation, which sponsored conferences conducted by the Council on World Tensions. Finally, in 1963, Clinchy became the founder, president, and director of The Institute on Man and Science at Rensselaerville, New York. The Institute is, in effect, the successor organization to World Brotherhood and the Council on World Tensions.

Clinchy, with the help of the Junior Chamber [of Commerce] International, held conferences of the Council on World Tensions in New York City, Switzerland, Bombay, Chicago, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Britain, Brazil, and Malaysia. Leadership at these conferences was recruited from the internationally known Left: George V. Allen, Ralph Bunche, Brock Chisholm, Lincoln Gordon, Frank Graham, Paul Hoffman, Philip Jessup, Milton Katz, Kirtley Mather, Charles Percy, Lester Pearson, Harlow Shapley, and U Thant. Other leftists associated with Clinchy in his multi-faceted complex have included Andrew Cordier, Ernest Gross, Margaret Mead, George Romney, Anna Rosenberg, Adlai Stevenson, Barbara Ward, and Arthur K. Watson.

Finances have not been a problem for Clinchy, who has received the support of the Ford Foundation, the Beaumont Foundation, ALCOA, Bell & Howell, Fuller Brush, General Mills, IBM, Pan American World Airways, Pitney-Bowes, the Asia Foundation, Procter & Gamble, Time Incorporated, Yale & Towne, and Volkswagen of America. His conferences have enjoyed the hospitality of the University of Chicago, the University of Minnesota, the University of Bombay, the International Labor Organization, Oxford University, the University of Bahia, and the University of Wisconsin.

The Institute on Man and Science is not a membership organization. Its objectives are described as: "to create new forms of continuing liberal education for men and women at varying stages of formal education; to further general study of the sciences and humanities as related to the conservation and full development of human and natural resources; to encourage thought about and discussion of the major issues of our times; to increase understanding of the changing relationships among peoples and to work toward the development of world order under world law and the strengthening of the United Nations." In matter-of-fact terminology, the Institute has propagandized for UNESCO, the United Nations Special Fund, larger foreign "aid" handouts by the United States, the World Court, disarmament, membership for Red China in the United Nations, peaceful coexistence, UNICEF, and socialism as a world system.

Clinchy is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is an official of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been affiliated with the socialist League for Industrial Democracy. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

CHARLES COGEN was born on October 31, 1903 in New York City, son of Bessie Wishnick and Joseph Cogen. He married Tess Sohnittkramer. He is an alumnus of Cornell University (A.B., 1924), Fordham University (LL.B., 1927), and Columbia University (M.A., 1931).

From 1924 until 1930 and from 1933 until 1964, Cogen was a public school teacher in New York City. From 1930 until 1933, he practiced law in New York City. From 1948 until 1951, he was a teacher and the director of the Hudson Shore Labor School. From 1952 until 1964, he was president of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City and a delegate to the New York City Central Labor Council. Since 1964, he has been president of the American Federation of Teachers. Since 1956, he has been vice president in the industrial union department of the AFL-CIO, and since 1964, a member of the AFL-CIO's executive board. In 1958, he was a lecturer at the ultra-radical New School for Social Research, and in the same year was an unsuccessful candidate for New York City's Council.

Cogen has been on the national board of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action and the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

JOHN COGLEY was born on March 16, 1916 in Chicago, son of Anne Geenty and John Cogley. He married Theodora Schmidt. He is an alumnus of Loyola University of Chicago (Ph.B.). In 1948 and 1949, he pursued special studies in philosophy and theology at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. He edited *Religion in America* (1958) and *Natural Law and Modern Society* (1963).

From 1946 until 1948, Cogley was founding editor of *Today,* a magazine for Catholic students. From 1949 until 1955, he was an executive editor of *Commonweal,* a magazine controlled by lay Catholics whose political ideologies were decidedly left-of-center. From 1956 until 1965, he was on the executive staff of the ultra-leftist Fund for the Republic, and at the same time served as a personal assistant to the Fund's leftist president, Robert M. Hutchins. From 1965 until 1967, he was the senior writer on religious affairs for the *New York Times.* In 1967, he became the editor of *The Center,* the house organ for the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, an offshoot of the Fund for the Republic.

While Cogley was with *Commonweal,* he was approached by officials of the Fund for the Republic (President Robert M. Hutchins and Vice President W.H. "Ping" Ferry) and asked to direct a study on alleged blacklisting in the entertainment industry.

Cogley accepted the Hutchins-Ferry proposition. The blacklisting study was financed with a grant of $100,000 from the Fund for the Republic. Cogley received a consultant's fee for the eight months he devoted to his directorship. He was given *carte blanche* in the selection of his staff. His choices were an indication that he had no aspirations to produce an objective report. The report that was produced eventually appeared in two volumes: *Blacklisting: Movies* and *Blacklisting: Radio-Television.*

Among Cogley's associates in the blacklisting study were: Michael Harrington, an active and prominent Socialist; Marie Jahoda, a Socialist and a bitter critic of government loyalty programs; Paul Jacobs, a one-time member of the Young Communist League and a continuing anti-anti-Communist; and Elizabeth Poe, who was identified under oath by journalist Frederick Woltman as a long-time member of the Communist faction within the Newspaper Guild at *Time* magazine. Among Cogley's chief sources of information was Arnold Forster, chief counsel for the defamatory Anti-Defamation League and one of the nation's most determined and effective anti-anti-Communists.

The publication of Cogley's two-volume report created a furor in entertainment and anti-Communist circles. Chairman Francis Walter of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was sufficiently disturbed to subpoena Cogley, whose testimony was heard on July 10, 1956. Mr. Walter, in announcing the subpoena, said: "In this period of cold war the major battlefield is in the minds of men and the outcome of the issue of our ultimate survival or defeat will be decided upon this battlefield. The mass media of information and entertainment are one of the most sensitive areas of this struggle and the questions which affect them are of crucial importance to the welfare and security of the nation." Mr. Walter was very much concerned that Cogley and his associates had produced a serious indictment against anti-Communists in the entertainment industry.

At the conclusion of the "blacklisting" hearings, Mr. Walter said: "The bed-rock facts with reference to . . . these hearings are as follows: So-called *Blacklisting Report*: (1) The Fund for the Republic, a multimillion-dollar, tax-exempt organization, issued a report contending that there is in vogue in the entertainment industry a blacklist of persons who are deprived of employment because of political affiliations or beliefs. If true, this situation would certainly be a threat to our American traditions. (2) The facts revealed at the hearings have established that there is not and never has been in the entertainment industry any practice of depriving people of employment because of 'political affiliations or beliefs,' but that a number of people who have been identified as hard-core members of the Communist conspiracy have been refused access to mass media of communications. This fact was established, not only by the examination in public session of John Cogley, who conducted the bogus investigation for the Fund for the Republic, but also by the testimony of the ablest leaders of Nation-wide anti-Communist organizations, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars. These leaders roundly condemned the Fund for the Republic report as a fraud and a tool for use by the Communists in preventing the immunization of Communist agents from the entertainment circles of this Nation."

The "blacklisting" project was not the sole or last contribution by Cogley to leftism. He has been affiliated with the militant leftwing Congress of Racial Equality in its agitational activities. He has been a member of the ultra-leftwing Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the Anti-Defamation League. During John F. Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign, Cogley was a member of Kennedy's "religious" staff, which promoted insinuations and charges of bigotry against the Republican Party. In recent years, Cogley has been a member of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, an ultra-leftwing pacifist group.

JEFFERY COHELAN was born on June 24, 1914 in San Francisco. He married Evelyn Ellis. He is an alumnus of the University of California at Berkeley (A.B.). In 1953 and 1954, he was a Fulbright research scholar in England at the University of Leeds and Oxford University.

From 1942 until 1959, Cohelan was secretary and treasurer of the Milk Drivers and Dairy Employees Local 302 in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in California. From 1949 until 1953, he was a member of the Berkeley Welfare Commission. From 1955 until 1958, he was a member of Berkeley's City Council. Since 1959, he has been in the U.S. Congress, representing California's seventh congressional district.

In Congress, on domestic issues, Cohelan has been one of the most reliable of the far-left Democrats. He has employed socialist terminology and followed the socialist line faithfully on all domestic programs. He has been strong for extravagant welfare handouts, for minimum wage laws, for the so-called war on poverty, for federal housing programs, for the boondoggling model cities projects, and for the so-called teachers' corps. On civil rights legislation, he has been an echo of the most militant of the racial agitators. He has supported, but has never been satisfied with the extent of, federal subsidization of education or federal gun control laws.

Cohelan worked hard to abolish the

House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been unremitting in his hostility to internal security measures because he believes there is too much "guilt by association."

The United Nations has been an especial favorite of Cohelan as he has followed the ultra-liberal line of devotion to "man's best hope for peace." He has advocated the creation of a permanent UN "peacekeeping" force, and the ratification of the UN's Declaration of Human Rights and the UN's Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination. On several occasions, he has proposed the construction of a UN monument on Alcatraz Island to commemorate the founding of the UN and "to serve as a symbol of peace."

Cohelan has been one of the leading disarmament buffs in the Congress. He wants "to avoid Armageddon" and he has employed some of the most hysterical and feverish arguments in the Congress against defensive measures such as the anti-ballistic missile system.

On foreign policy matters, Cohelan has been a totally reliable ultra-liberal internationalist. He has supported any and all foreign "aid" measures with the singular exception of military aid. He has urged a continually expanding United States trade with Communist countries. He has been an enthusiastic sponsor of the Peace Corps. There have been times, however, when Cohelan has been almost incoherent on foreign policy issues such as those involved with Cuba, Berlin, and the Dominican Republic. At such times, he has seemed to be compelled to say something, even if nothing more than a paraphrase of a *New York Times* editorial. He never did understand the Nigerian-Biafran situation, but he talked about it anyway.

Cohelan's biggest venture into foreign affairs was his concern with the Vietnam War. As late as 1965, he was most anxious to save South Vietnam. He held to the domino theory for Southeast Asia and talked a convincing anti-Communist line. This posture, however, did not last. Soon he was echoing the sentiments and observations of the "no-win" lobby: Mike Mansfield, Robert McNamara, Edwin Reischauer, Dean Rusk, Harrison Salisbury, Robert Scalapino, and the editorial staff of the *New York Times.* Before the end of 1965, Cohelan proclaimed that "there can be no military solution to this problem" of the Vietnam War. Therefore, he was firmly behind Lyndon Johnson and urged the President to mount a diplomatic offensive, especially through the offices of the United Nations.

By 1966, Cohelan was fearful of "escalation" and was worried about Red China. His ultra-liberal litany included a plea to refrain from bombing Haiphong and to seek a political victory. By 1967, he wanted a total cessation of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam and recommended that any peace negotiations include representatives of the Viet Cong. In 1968, he rallied behind Senator Edward M. Kennedy, who was virtually conducting a war against the Saigon government. By 1969, Cohelan had become an unmistakable convert to the ranks of the most leftish of the congressional doves, expressing willingness to see the United States abandon its efforts so that the South Vietnamese could fight the war by themselves.

In 1970, Cohelan's political fortunes suffered an unexpected interruption when – despite his ultra-liberal credentials – he failed to be renominated by his constituents, who chose instead a comparatively inexperienced liberal candidate. Cohelan's defeat was all the more surprising since he had risen to prominence in the Democratic Study Group, the most influential band of leftists in the Congress.

CHARLES W. COLE was born on February 8, 1906 in Montclair, New Jersey, son of Bertha Dwight and Charles Cole. He married Katharine Salmon. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (A.B., 1927) and Columbia University (A.M., 1928; Ph.D., 1931).

From 1928 until 1935, Cole was a history instructor at Columbia University. From 1935 until 1940, he was at Amherst College, as associate professor of economics (1935-1937) and professor of economics (1937-1940). From 1940 until 1946, he was a professor of history at Columbia. In 1932 and 1933, he had a traveling fellowship from the leftward-oriented Social Science Research Council. In 1938 and 1939, he was a visiting lecturer in economics at Yale University. In 1942 and 1943, he worked for the Office of Price Administration.

From 1946 until 1960, Cole was president of Amherst College, and in 1960, he became president emeritus. In 1960 and 1961, he was vice president of the Rockefeller Foundation, a pillar of the Liberal Establishment. From 1961 until 1964, Cole was United States Ambassador to Chile.

Cole is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Under the aegis of Redliner Robert M. Hutchins, Cole has served on the board of directors of the pro-Socialist Fund for the Republic and its offshoot, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

JAMES B. CONANT was born on March 26, 1893 in Dorchester, Massachusetts, son of Jennett Bryant and James Conant. He married Grace Richards. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1913; Ph.D., 1916). He is the author and/or co-author of numerous books on chemistry. He is also the author of *Academical Patronage and Superintendence: An Historical Discussion of the Appointment of Professors in Universities* (1938); *Speaking as a Private Citizen* (1941); *Our Fighting Faith* (1942); *Education in a Divided World* (1948); *Our Future in the Atomic Age* (1951); *Education and Liberty: The Role of Schools in a Modern Democracy* (1953); *The Citadel of Learning* (1956); *The Identification and Education of the Academically Talented Student in the American Secondary School* (1958); *Germany and Freedom: A Personal Appraisal* (1958); *The American High School Today* (1959); *The Child, the Parent, and the State* (1959); *Creativity of Gifted and Talented Children* (1959); *The Revolutionary Transformation of the American High School* (1959); *Recommendation for Education in the Junior High Schools: A Memorandum to School Boards* (1960); *Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas* (1961); *Trial and Error in the Improvement of Education* (1961); *Thomas Jefferson and the Development of American Public Education* (1962); *The Education of American Teachers* (1963); *Shaping Educational Policy* (1964); *Two Modes of Thought: My Encounters with Science and Education* (1964); *The Comprehensive High School* (1967); and *My Several Lives: Memoirs of a Social Inventor* (1970); and co-author of *Education for a Classless Society* (1940).

From 1919 until 1933, Conant was a professor of chemistry at Harvard University. From 1933 until 1953, he was

Harvard's president. During this period, from 1941 until 1946, he served as deputy director in the Office of Scientific Research and Development and organized scientists for the Manhattan (atom bomb) Project. From 1947 until 1952, he was a member of the general advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission.

In 1949, Conant was responsible for organizing the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools, later known as the National Citizens Council for Better Schools. He was also a longtime member of the Educational Policies Commission, sponsored by the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators.

From 1953 until 1955, Conant was the United States High Commissioner for Germany. From 1955 until 1957, he was the United States Ambassadoı to the Federal Republic of Germany. (William F. Buckley Jr., writing in *National Review*, March 10, 1964, provided an interesting footnote to the circumstances surrounding Conant's confirmation as Ambassador: "I speak about his [Dwight D. Eisenhower's] memoirs, *Mandate for Change.* On p. 319, in a chapter devoted largely to the evils of Senator [Joseph R.] McCarthy, he points out that the Senator 'depended upon consistent attack' for its 'publicity value,' and gives as an instance that 'in a letter to me [Senator McCarthy] made wild charges against James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard University, when I nominated that distinguished educator as United States High Commissioner to the Federal Republic of Germany.' Now the facts are as follows: Early in 1953, McCarthy set out to prepare a speech giving the reasons why he thought Dr. Conant should not be sent to Germany as our High Commissioner. He asked me to write that speech, which I did, after agreement had been reached on what it should say. Three points were made. None of them remotely insinuated that Dr. Conant might be disloyal. None of them was in any way 'wild.' Dr. Conant, the proposed speech said, was a poor choice to send to Germany because (a) he was one of the earliest endorsers of the Morgenthau Plan idea for Germany; because (b) he did not, as witness his then recent call for the abolition of private schools, and certain other cited articles and speeches, truly understand American life, and so was not in a good position to be our representative to a renascent Germany searching for free ideals; and because (c) in the field of security, an important responsibility of a High Commissioner, he was naïve, as witness his then recent statement about the presumptive immunity of Harvard from penetration by even a single Communist. [It is inconceivable, he had told a congressional committee, that any member of the Harvard faculty was a Communist. To which the obvious reply, of course, was that it was inconceivable that the Communist Party, over the years, should think of Harvard as too unimportant a place to try to penetrate.]" The nomination of Conant was approved in the Senate by a vote of four to two. Senator Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts, the Republican whip, engineered the confirmation on a Friday night at seven o'clock, when he knew that most of the Senators had left Washington for the weekend. The major wire services failed to report that the vote had been four to two, and the only newspaper in the country that carried this news was the *Boston Post.* See John Kelson, "Inside Story of Conant 'Coup' Finally Told By Sen. Dworshak," *Boston Post,* March 22, 1953.)

From 1957 until 1963, Conant produced reports on American education under the auspices of the Carnegie Corporation, which granted about $1,000,000 for the project. From 1963 until 1965, he was an educational adviser to the Ford Foundation; he spent those years in Berlin, Germany.

Conant's leftist-liberal credentials include his membership in Freedom House, the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Council for Civic Responsibility, and the Foreign Policy Association. He was a determined critic of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, who was working strenuously to root Communists out of government posts. He was a staunch defender of the notorious security risk, J. Robert Oppenheimer. He was opposed to the development of the hydrogen bomb. He instituted Harvard's Nieman fellowship program, which has been a boon to leftwing journalists for three decades. He views Communism from the empty-belly perspective ("The history of Communism shows that it feeds upon discontented, frustrated, unemployed people") – an attitude of liberals who refuse to admit the historical reality that Communism has fed upon political units and populations that have been subverted, terrorized, and ravaged.

Few academicians in American history have been more glorified than Conant. He has been the recipient of more than fifty honorary degrees. He has received the United States Medal of Merit, the Woodrow Wilson Award, the Medal of Freedom, the Great Living American Award, the Sylvanus Thayer Award, the Freedom House Award, and the Atomic Pioneer Award.

In the full context of Conant's prolific writings on education, he has managed to offer something for traditional educators and for progressive educationists. But over and above his ambivalence, he emerges as an effective and influential foe of private and parochial schools. He is also a foe of community-controlled schools, and he has stated flatly that no high school with a graduating class of less than one hundred can function properly.

Conant has frequently insisted that he deplores the idea of the federal government controlling education. Yet he has been one of the most ardent advocates of federal financing for education. He has urged the use of federal funds to promote research in all fields of learning, to educate teachers, and to educate Negroes. He has gone so far as to recommend that the federal government dispense funds to the states for general educational needs rather than categorical needs. But at the same time, he insists that even though the federal government is the financial patron of education, it is only a junior partner to the states in the educational system.

One of Conant's most ambitious plans has been to influence the establishment of a "national educational policy." He has despaired of having such a policy imposed on state and local educational systems by the federal government. He has therefore recommended that at least the more populous states enter into a compact to plan a national educational policy. The interstate partners could work in harmony with the federal government to propose educational standards. (In a veiled threat, Conant said: "Either the States individually and collectively must plan or Washington will be forced to endeavor to determine detailed policy in many areas where the partnership [States and federal government] . . . should prevail.")

Conant despises the diversity which has been traditional in American education: "We talk about the United States as a land of equal opportunity for all youth. Yet we tolerate methods of financing public education that can result in a threefold difference in the costs per pupil between one school district and another within the borders of a single state . . . . Only a very few states have anything like a master plan for the expansion of public facilities for education beyond the high school . . . . Every degree-granting institution is chartered by one of the fifty states and in theory subject to some sort of reasonable control. Yet only a few [?] states have attempted to protect the public against educational fraud . . . . Whether we like it or not, the local school boards are creations of the state. But education has become too important for our welfare as a nation to be left to tens of thousands of school boards with as little guidance as is provided in most states. Educational isolationism can no longer be afforded in this country. We cannot simply shrug off what happens in school districts other than our own."

Conant denies vigorously that he advocates an educational policy imposed by the federal government. He denies that he desires the abolition of school boards. Yet there is no doubt that he will never be content until every school district in every state is totally standardized: curriculum, expenditures, teacher-student ratio, guidance programs, aptitude and achievement testing procedures, certification of teachers, and the length of the school day and school year. And he would apply the same sort of standardization to state colleges, junior colleges, and universities.

On the matter of racial segregation in schools, Conant has shown a remarkable agility in changing positions. In 1961, he wrote: "In some cities, political leaders have attempted to put pressure on the school authorities to have Negro children attend essentially white schools. In my judgment the cities in which the authorities have yielded to this pressure are on the wrong track. Those which have not done so, like Chicago, are more likely to make progress in improving Negro education. It is my belief that satisfactory education can be provided in an all-Negro school through the expenditure of more money for needed staff and facilities. Moreover, I believe that any sense of inferiority among the pupils caused by the absence of white children can be largely if not wholly eliminated in two ways: first, in all cities there will be at least some schools that are in fact mixed because of the nature of the neighborhood they serve; second, throughout the city there ought to be an integrated staff of white and Negro teachers and administrators. To insist that such solutions cannot be acceptable and to assume, instead, that the schooling of Negroes can be satisfactory only if in each schoolroom there are present some white children is to take an extremely defeatist view of Negro education in the large cities. The proposal to move any appreciable number of white children by bus into what are now Negro schools or to move all the Negro children in a Negro neighborhood into what are now white schools presents a transportation problem that is quite insoluble . . . . An examination of the geography of the Negro and white sections of large cities makes this evident. If some children are to be transported, the question arises: Which children and how many? . . . The crossing of school-attendance lines when waves of population movement create overcrowded conditions in one area and vacancies in another . . . . The more one considers the matter, the more one is convinced that children should not be manipulated for the purpose of seating Negro children in white schools, or vice versa."

Three years later, in 1964, Conant recommended that redistricting of school zones should provide that in each school there should be a percentage quota of Negroes and whites in direct relation to the racial makeup of the community. In 1967, when asked whether youngsters in all-Negro schools could obtain a good education, he answered: "We have to assume that they can – otherwise we would have to be very defeatist over the outlook in cities where the population is or will become 50 per cent Negro or more."

By 1970, Conant had joined the ranks of the forcible integrationists. He admitted that because of geographic considerations there would necessarily be some communities with all-Negro schools. But he suggested that, wherever possible, busing should be done to provide racial integration, and said that where segregated schools existed, they "must be considered only as an intermediate phase."

CHARLES CORYELL was born on February 21, 1912 in Los Angeles, son of Florence Cook and William Coryell. He was married to and divorced from Meta Seward. His second wife was the late Grace Seeley. His third wife is Barbara Buchman. He is an alumnus of the California Institute of Technology (B.S., 1932; Ph.D., 1935).

From 1935 until 1938, Coryell was a research assistant at the California Institute of Technology. From 1937 until 1939, he was a chemistry instructor at Deep Springs Junior College in California. From 1938 until 1945, he was on the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles, in the chemistry department: as instructor (1938-1940); assistant professor (1940-1944); and associate professor (1944-1945). (From 1942 until 1945, he was on leave from UCLA while working on the atom-bomb project at the University of Chicago and at Oak Ridge, Tennessee.)

Since 1946, Coryell has been a professor of chemistry at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and he has also served as a consultant to the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1953 and 1954, he was a fellow at the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel. In 1963, he was a Guggenheim fellow and a Fulbright lecturer in France.

Coryell has been affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the leftist-globalist United World Federalists; the Federation of American Scientists, a group of bleeding-heart, leftwing pacifists; the Council for a Livable World, an ultra-leftwing, pacifist, and political pressure group; and the leftwing-pacifist Civil Defense Letter Committee. He is a veteran of the infamous Pugwash conferences and has been an activist in the anti-Vietnam War peacenik protests.

VERN COUNTRYMAN was born on May 13, 1917 in Roundup, Montana, son of Carrie Harriman and Alexander Countryman. He married Vera Pound. He is an alumnus of the University of Washington (B.A., 1939; LL.B., 1942). In 1947 and 1948, he was a graduate student at Yale University's Law School. He was admitted to the bar in Washington (1942), in Maryland (1955), and in the District of Columbia (1956).

In 1942 and 1943, Countryman was a law clerk to Associate Justice of the Supreme Court William O. Douglas. (In 1959, he wrote *Douglas of the Supreme Court,* a maudlin tribute to his early benefactor.) In 1946, he was an assistant attorney-general of Washington, and in 1946 and 1947, he was an instructor at the University of Washington's Law School. From 1948 until 1955, he was an assistant professor and associate professor at Yale Law School. From 1955 until 1959, he was engaged in private law practice. From 1959 until 1964, he was dean of the University of New Mexico's Law School. Since 1964, he has been a professor at Harvard University's Law School.

Countryman is a national committeeman of the American Civil Liberties Union. He has long been a staunch foe of anti-Communist investigations. (For example, see Countryman's *Un-American Activities in the State of Washington,* 1959, and his contribution to the symposium, *The States and Subversion,* published in 1952.)

On February 4, 1966, Countryman addressed a group at Harvard Law School. A report of the speech, written by Mandy Hawes, appeared in the *Harvard Law Record,* February 10, 1966. Wrote Hawes: "Recent witch-hunts of the House Un-American Activities Committee are endangering First Amendment rights, Professor Vern L. Countryman told the Civil Rights Committee last Thursday. Prof. Countryman, who is chairman of the Massachusetts chapter of the State Committee to Abolish the Un-American Activities Committee . . . announced that the group has approached New England Congressmen to enlist their aid . . . . During his talk, he sketched a brief history of the opposition to the Committee which has been spearheaded by a California social worker, Frank Wilkinson, who came to Countryman in 1956, greatly disturbed that his fellow social workers were being mistreated by HUAC.

"Prof. Countryman said that up to this time the committee hadn't troubled Wilkinson because he was too 'apolitical' to take any interest in at all. But soon after he founded the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, the House group became exceedingly interested in what used to seem like 'apolitical' activities . . . . Wilkinson was called before the House Committee and accused of being a Communist . . . . Wilkinson was convicted of contempt for refusing to answer questions . . . . "

The characterization of Wilkinson and the account of Wilkinson's tribulations, as given by Countryman to the Harvard Law School audience, bear little – if any – resemblance to the truth. In the *Eleventh Report* of the California Senate Fact-Finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities (1961), it is stated: "We remind you that Mr. [Frank] Wilkinson once held a high-salaried position with the Los Angeles City Housing Authority, and he was exposed before this Committee in an executive hearing, and discharged from his position in 1952. [The West Coast Communist newspaper, the *People's World,* on October 30, 1952, lamented the fact that Wilkinson was fired because he refused to answer questions pertaining to his Communist Party affiliations.] Mr. Wilkinson at one time directed the security apparatus of the Communist Party of Los Angeles County. Since that time he has been engaged as a full-time coordinator of the Communist attempt to liquidate un-American activities committees on a nation-wide scale."

Countryman described Wilkinson as a "social worker." The California Committee had this to say: "His [Wilkinson's] experience in charge of security for the Communist Party in Los Angeles and his fanatic dedication to Communism made him peculiarly capable in this role [of organizing and maintaining liaison with front organizations and student groups to discredit the HCUA], and it may be parenthetically stated that one of this Committee's informants who was in the party with Wilkinson in Los Angeles declared that he was the only Party member the informant had ever known who would not hesitate to carry out an act of extreme violence without the slightest hesitation if ordered to do so by his Communist superior."

By Countryman's account, the HCUA was not interested in Wilkinson until "after he founded the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee." The NCAHUAC was organized by Wilkinson on August 15, 1960. Wilkinson testified before the HCUA on December 7, 1956, and on July 30, 1958. The HCUA was interested in Wilkinson's activities as head of the Citizens Committee to Preserve American Freedoms, which was organized in 1952 as a Communist front to specialize in propaganda aimed at abolishing the HCUA and discrediting the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The HCUA was also interested in Wilkinson's work with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, which was organized in 1951 as a Communist front with the abolition of the HCUA as its main objective. The HCUA had information that Wilkinson was "a hard-core member of the Communist Party . . . designated by the Communist Party for the purpose of creating and manipulating certain organizations" in working to abolish the HCUA.

Contrary to Countryman's version, Wilkinson was not accused of being a Communist when he appeared before the HCUA. He was identified as a Communist by an undercover agent of the FBI. Wilkinson was given every opportunity to deny the identification, but he refused to respond to any questions asked by the HCUA and its staff.

Wilkinson was convicted of contempt of Congress for his refusal to answer questions. On August 15, 1960 – after his conviction and while his case was under appeal – he organized the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. (The top-heavy representation of Communists in official positions indicated that the Communist Party's leaders were taking no chance of the slightest deviation from the Party's line by NCAHUAC.) Countryman, while in New Mexico, signed Wilkinson's petition against the HCUA when it was printed in the *New York Times* in February 1961. When Countryman went to Massachusetts to teach at Harvard Law School, he headed a Massachusetts branch of the NCAHUAC. The foregoing all means that Countryman has worked hand-in-hand with one of the nation's most dedicated Communist Party functionaries on a project organized and directed by the Communist Party – a rather curious avocation for a professor of law, former law school dean, and former clerk to an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

GEORGE S. COUNTS was born on December 9, 1889 in Baldwin City, Kansas, son of Mertie Gamble and James Counts. He married Lois Bailey. He is an alumnus of Baker University (A.B., 1911) and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1916).

From 1916 until 1918, Counts was head of the department of education and director of the summer school at Delaware College. In 1918 and 1919, he was a professor of educational sociology at Harris Teachers' College in St. Louis, Missouri. In 1919 and 1920, he was a professor of secondary education at the University of Washington. From 1920 until 1926, he was on the faculty at Yale University as an associate professor (1920-1924) and professor (1924-1926) of secondary education. In 1926 and 1927, he was a professor of education at the University of Chicago. From 1927 until 1956, he was a professor of education at Columbia University's Teachers College. He became emeritus professor in 1956. He has been a visiting professor or lecturer at Harvard University, the University of Colorado, Northwestern University, the University of Pittsburgh, Michigan State University, and Southern Illinois University.

Counts is the author of *The Selective Character of American Education; The Senior High School Curriculum; The Social Composition of Boards of Education; The School and Society in Chicago; Secondary Education and Industrialism; The American Road to Culture; A Ford Crosses America; The Soviet Challenge to America; Dare the School Build a New Social Order?; The Social Foundations of Education; The Prospects of American Democracy; The Schools Can Teach Democracy; The Education of Free Men; Education and the Promise of America; The Country of the Blind: The Soviet System of Mind Control; Point Four and Education; American Education through the Soviet Looking Glass; Education and American Civilization; Decision-Making and American Values in School Administration; The Challenge of Soviet Education; Khrushchev and the Central Committee Speak on Education;* and *Education and the Foundations of Human Freedom.* He is the co-author of *Principles of Education* and *America, Russia and the Communist Party in the Post-War World.* He translated *New Russia's Primer* and *I Want To Be Like Stalin.*

At Columbia's Teachers College, Counts – along with William H. Kilpatrick – became one of the most aggressive and influential disciples of John Dewey, the patriarch of permissive, progressive education. On and off campus, Counts was in the vanguard of the Deweyite educationists, who strove to dominate and control public school education at all levels in order to promote a socialist society and a socialist economic system under a collectivist government in the United States; and early in his career at Columbia, it became obvious that Counts' ideal was what existed in Stalin's Soviet Union.

From 1927 until 1932, Counts was associate director of the Institute of International Education at Columbia University. Under the auspices of the Institute, Counts traveled to the Soviet Union in 1927 and 1929. In 1933 and 1934, when the Institute sponsored summer school sessions at Moscow University, he was a member of the Institute's advisory council. The program was carried on in conjunction with the Soviet Union's commissariat of education and its official tourist agency, Intourist. At the Moscow sessions, hundreds of American educators were propagandized by Communist experts.

Counts' own visits to the Soviet Union made him a warm admirer of the Communists' educational system. This was quite evident in his 1931 book, *The Soviet Challenge to America,* in which he wrote: "The world today is full of social experimentation. There is one experiment, however, that dwarfs all others – so bold indeed in its ideals and its program that few can contemplate it without emotion . . . .

"Soviet Russia is endeavoring with all the resources at her command to bring the economic order under a measure of rational control . . . . She issues to the Western nations and particularly to the United States a challenge – perhaps one of the greatest challenges of history. But she issues it not through the Communist International, nor through the Red Army, nor through the Gąy-Pay-00 (political police), as most of our citizens naively and timorously believe, but through her State Planning Commission and her system of public education . . . .

"In the societies of the West in general and in the United States of America in particular the evolution of institutions proceeds for the most part without plan or design, as a sort of byproduct of the selfish competition of individuals, groups and enterprises for private gain. In Russia, on the other hand, since the days of 1917, the Soviet government has sought to promote the rational and orderly development of the entire social economy . . . [and] a whole civilization is harnessing its energies and is on the march toward consciously determined goals . . . .

"If the revolution is successful the social order which is emerging today in Soviet Russia will first of all be collectivistic. In its essence this means that the institution of private property, at least insofar as it applies to land and the tools of production, will be abolished. It also means that no individual will be able to acquire great wealth, that the motive of personal gain will cease to drive the wheels of the economic order . . . and that land, railroads, factories, mills, shops, houses, and natural resources will be owned collectively and administered in the interests of all."

Counts exulted that in the Soviet Union "new principles of right and wrong are being forged. Under such conditions the commonplaces of American education sound like faint voices from a distant and mythical land."

After his experiences in the Soviet Union, Counts could find little or nothing right in the United States: "The idea of building a new society . . . is certainly no worse than the drive towards individual success which permeates not only the schools but every department of culture in the United States. If one were to compare the disciplined effort of the Soviet to industrialize the country, to socialize agriculture, to abolish poverty, to banish disease, to liquidate unemployment, to disseminate knowledge, and generally to raise the material and spiritual level of the masses, with the selfish scramble for wealth and privilege . . . in America, one would find small grounds for complacency. Whatever may be said on the other side concerning the regimentation of opinion and the restriction of individual freedom, there exists in Soviet Russia today an idealism and a driving passion for human betterment which contrasts strangely with the widespread cynicism of the United States. It is only natural that this idealism and this passion should sweep through the schools . . . . "

In 1932, Counts read a paper ("Dare Progressive Education be Progressive?") to a conference of the Progressive Education Association (later renamed the American Education Fellowship). He was obviously disturbed that American educationists were backward in comparison with their Soviet counterparts: "If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence of [the upper middle class], face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become somewhat less frightened than it is today at the bogeys of imposition and indoctrination." And Counts, who was so impressed with the "idealism" he had found in Soviet Russia, told his progressive colleagues that "changes in our economic system [toward collectivism] will, of course, require changes in our ideals."

In his Baltimore speech, Counts blueprinted a revolutionary task for the progressive educationists: "To my mind, a movement honestly styling itself progressive should engage in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life, a tradition possessing power, appeal, and direction. But, you will say, is this not leading us out upon very dangerous ground? Is it not taking us rather far from the familiar landmarks bounding the fields that teachers are wont to cultivate? My answer is, of course, in the affirmative . . . .

"You will also say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative, or, at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me. We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born. For the school to work in a somewhat different direction with all the power at its disposal could do no great harm. At the most, unless the superiority of its outlook is unquestioned, it can but serve as a counterpoise to check and challenge the power of less enlightened or more selfish purposes."

In his 1932 book, *Dare the School Build a New Social Order?,* Counts returned to the theme of indoctrination as a prerogative of the progressive educationists: "That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals and behavior of the coming generation . . . [and] it is my observation that the men and women who have affected the course of human events are those who have not hesitated to use the power that has come to them."

Meanwhile, Counts found himself in a position to influence many more than the educationists. In 1926, the American Historical Association appointed a commission of nine to investigate and study the teaching of "history and other social studies in the schools." In 1928, the commission was enlarged to sixteen members and was granted $340,000 by the Carnegie Corporation, and Counts became the commission's research director. Between 1928 and 1934, Counts and his colleagues produced the *Report of the Commission on Social Studies,* the most important and durable part being the "Conclusions and Recommendations," wherein Counts' influence was unmistakable.

In the "Conclusions and Recommendations," social science courses were to be the core of school curricula, in order to foster indoctrination for collectivism. The "progressives" would re-write textbooks and teachers' syllabi and prepare other teaching materials for indoctrination purposes.

The text of "Conclusions and Recommendations" appeared to be a paraphrase of Counts' earlier writings: "Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.

" . . . The specific form which this collectivism . . . will take . . . is by no means clear . . . . It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property or it may entail the preservation of private property extended and distributed among the masses.

"Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligations, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedures to the requirements of the emerging integrated order.

"The writers of textbooks may be expected to revamp and rewrite their old works in accordance with this frame of reference . . . . Makers of programs in the social sciences . . . may be expected . . . to recast existing syllabi and schemes of instruction in accordance with their judgment . . . .

" . . . Colleges and universities offering courses of instruction for teachers will review their current programs and provide for prospective teachers courses of instruction in general harmony with the Commission's frame of reference."

In 1933, Counts was chairman of the Progressive Education Association's committee on social and economic problems. In that same year, the committee issued "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation," which was nothing less than an endorsement of the "Conclusions and Recommendations" being issued by the Counts-led commission of the American Historical Association.

In 1934, the Deweyite "progressives" – especially those at Columbia's Teachers College – began to publish and write for *The Social Frontier.* From 1934 until 1937, Counts was the magazine's editor. In the first issue the editorial said: "For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and the age of collectivism is opening.

" . . . [*The Social Frontier*] represents a point of view, it has a frame of reference, it stands on a particular interpretation of American history. It accepts the analysis of the current epoch presented above and outlined in greater detail in 'Conclusions and Recommendations,' *Report of the Commission on Social Studies* of the American Historical Association."

Counts spread his gospel of collectivism in many ways. From 1936 until 1942, he was on the educational policies commission of the National Education Association. From 1939 until 1942, he was president of the American Federation of Teachers. In 1940, he began a long tenure as a national committeeman for the American Civil Liberties Union. From 1942 until 1944, he was the New York State Chairman of the American Labor Party, which was no more than a device whereby Communists ran their candidates without the inconvenience and stigma of a Communist Party label. From 1955 until 1959, he was New York State Chairman for the Liberal Party, founded by the ultra-leftwing labor leaders, Alex Rose and David Dubinsky. Also in the political arena, Counts was a founder of the leftwing Union for Democratic Action.

In 1949, after more than two decades as a devoted apologist for the Soviet Union, Counts suffered a temporary reversal of form. He was disturbed that some of his academic associates in the Soviet Union had unaccountably and physically disappeared when they became unpopular with the Stalinist regime; and by 1951, Counts concluded that Soviet leaders had achieved an "all-embracing system of mind-control." Of course Counts never admitted that he had been an activist in the promotion of Soviet-style mind-control in the United States. And he never recanted his impressive history of leftwing affiliations. These included: the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance ("Communist front"); the American League Against War and Fascism ("subversive and Communist"); the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners ("subversive and Communist"); the National Committee for People's Rights ("entirely under the control of the Communist Party"); Consumers National Federation ("Communist front"); American Friends of Spanish Democracy ("subversive"); the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American Student Union ("Communist front"); the Student Congress against War ("controlled by the Communists"); the New York Tom Mooney Committee ("Communist front"); the Coordinating Committee to Lift the [Spanish] Embargo ("Communist front"); the American-Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); Friends of the Soviet Union ("to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government" – "directed from Moscow"); the Institute of Pacific Relations ("a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives"); the American Pushkin Committee ("Communist front"); American Friends of the Chinese People ("Communist front"); the American Youth Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the National Committee against Censorship of Theatre Arts ("Communist front"); the People's Congress for Democracy and Peace ("Communist front"); Films for Democracy ("Communist front"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); and the Workers' Defense League (a leftwing group defending political undesirables who are subject to deportation).

JOHN COWLES was born on December 14, 1898 in Algona, Iowa, son of Florence Call and Gardner Cowles. He married Elizabeth Bates. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1921).

Since 1920, Cowles has been associated on a top executive level with his family's various publishing enterprises: the Des Moines Register and Tribune Company, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Company, and Cowles Magazines, publishers of *Look* magazine.

Cowles has been affiliated with the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a group which, since 1948, has campaigned for and financed ultra-leftist candidates for the House and Senate. He has been a long time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a member of the Business Advisory Council, the CFR's patronage link with the federal government. He has been a trustee of the statist-internationalist-oriented American Assembly. He has been a trustee of the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation. He has been a director of the leftist-internationalist American Association for the United Nations.

MALCOLM COWLEY was born on August 24, 1898 in Belsano, Pennsylvania, son of Josephine Hutmacher and William Cowley. He was married to and divorced from Marguerite Baird. He is married to Muriel Maurer. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1920) and the University of Montpellier, France (*diplome*, 1922).

From 1925 until 1929, Cowley was a free-lance writer and translator. In that period, he wrote a volume of poetry and translated seven works from French to English. From 1929 until 1944, he was an associate and literary editor of the ultra-radical *New Republic* magazine, in whose pages he became conspicuous as an apologist for the Soviet Union's dictator Joseph Stalin. (For a brief period in 1941 and 1942, Cowley had an $8000-a-year job as chief information analyst with the Office of Facts and Figures, which became Elmer Davis' Red-lined Office of War Information. Chairman Martin Dies of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities spoke on the floor of the House of Representatives about Cowley's Communist-front activities. Cowley resigned his position a few weeks later.)

In the 1930's, Cowley was closely associated with the Communist Party. On at least one occasion, he spoke to a mass meeting of the Communist Party. He campaigned for Communist Party candidates in the national elections of 1932, and in New York City elections in 1936 and 1938.

Cowley earned a reputation as a fellow traveler through his affiliations with an extensive list of leftwing groups, including the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee for Struggle Against War ("Communist front"); the American League Against War and Fascism ("subversive and Communist"); *Fight* ("a Communist publication"); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); American Friends of Spanish Democracy ("subversive"); the American Society for Technical Aid to Spanish Democracy ("Communist front"); the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("Communist"); the American Relief Ship for Spain ("Communist Party front enterprise"); the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign ("Communist front"); the Conference on Pan-American Democracy ("Communist front"); Descendants of the American Revolution ("Communist front"); Friends of the Soviet Union ("to propagandize for and defend Russia and its system of government" – "directed from Moscow"); Frontier Films ("Communist front"); International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); the John Reed Clubs ("Communist front"); the National Congress for Unemployment and Social Insurance ("Communist front"); the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners ("Communist front"); the National People's Committee Against Hearst (" 'subsidiary' organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy" – "subversive and Communist"); the National Student League ("Communist front"); the Congress of American Revolutionary Writers ("subversive and Communist"); the League of American Writers ("subversive and Communist"); Book Union ("distributors of Communist literature"); the *Daily Worker* ("Communist Party publication"); *Soviet Russia Today* ("Communist front publication"); Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade ("subversive and Communist"); *China Today* (Communist Party-controlled publication); and the *Golden Book of American Friendship with the Soviet Union* (eulogies of the government of the Soviet Union).

HARVEY COX was born on May 19, 1929 in Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, son of Dorothea Dunwoody and Harvey Cox. He married Nancy Nieburger. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (A.B., 1951), Yale University (B.D., 1955), and Harvard University (Ph.D., 1963).

From 1955 until 1958, Cox was director of religious activites at Oberlin College. From 1958 until 1962, he was a program associate of the American Baptist Home Mission Society. In 1962 and 1963, he was a fraternal worker at the Gossner Mission of East Berlin (Germany). From 1963 until 1965, he was an assistant professor at the Andover Newton Theological (Baptist and Congregational) School in Massachusetts. Since 1965, he has been associate professor of church and society at Harvard Divinity School. In 1961, he was a consultant to the third assembly of the World Council of Churches at New Delhi, India. From 1963 until 1966, he was board chairman of the Blue Hill Christian Center in Massachusetts.

Cox is the author of *The Secular City* (1965), *God's Revolution and Man's Responsibility* (1965), and *On Not Leaving It To The Snake* (1967). He is an editorial board member of *Christianity and Crisis.* He contributes articles on a regular basis to *Commonweal* magazine and other journals. He wrote at least one article for *Playboy* magazine. He wrote a chapter for a symposium, *Marxism and Christianity,* edited by the notorious Communist Party theoretician Herbert Aptheker.

The Secular City is Cox's major claim to fame. Avant-gardists in religious and academic circles have hailed it as a major theological study. In reality, *Secular City* is a rejection of religion and a plea for a paradoxical secular Christianity. The volume is a hodgepodge of sociological gibberish, meaningless generalities, Marxian cant and theories, and pedantic affectations.

Marxism has long held an attraction for Cox, whose flair for economic determinism argues against the continuity of faith and religious belief. He has insisted that the Communists are worthy of emulation by Christians because the Communists have discovered (if they are worthy disciples of Marx) that all human thought, even theological thought, is determined pragmatically by specific situations in evolving human experiences.

Writing a book review in *Saturday Review* (September 18, 1965), Cox was practically ecstatic over a symposium put together by Erich Fromm wherein Karl Marx was described as a humanist. Cox denounced those who would consider Marx in any other light.

The absolutely phony Christian-Communist dialog which, in recent years, has become such an obsession for leftwing clergy and laity of all denominations, has had no more enthusiastic advocate than Cox. In *Christian Century* ("Let's End the Communist-Christian

Vendetta," November 9, 1966), he wrote: "It is certainly time to bring to a close the decades-long war of attrition between Christianity and communism. Nothing more exacerbates the global confrontation between East and West than the rhetoric that bills it as a duel to the death between God and atheism. It is clear that a dialogue between Christianity and Marxism is now possible. Both are talking about the full development of man (humanization and hominization [*sic*]). Both are concerned (each in its own time) with subjectivity and transcendence. Both are fascinated with the future and what it means for man's freedom, maturation and responsibility."

Cox's egalitarian approach toward Communists and Christians was not merely theoretical. In 1967, he journeyed to Marienbad in Communist Czecho-Slovakia to participate in a Christian-Marxist conference, sponsored by the Czech National Academy of Scientists.

In his contribution to Aptheker's *Marxism and Christianity,* Cox found the Communists more virtuous than Christians: "Is Christianity willing to allow its symbols and doctrines to be transformed so that they touch the hunger of contemporary man? Is the Church willing to abandon its millennium-long coalition with property and privilege and to identify completely as Jesus did with the oppressed and disinherited of the earth? Even more painfully, will Christians, who have preached the virtue of humility for centuries, be able to humble themselves enough to accept correction from Marxists?"

Beyond his "theology," Cox has been a leftist in other matters. He is a civil rights militant and frankly admits his admiration for the methodology of the non-Christian Gandhi and the late racist agitator Martin L. King Jr. (In 1968, speaking to students of Princeton Seminary, Cox's extraordinary sense of racism came to the fore when he advised the seminarians to strive for a suburban pastorate: "Suburban ministries can be the most difficult and exciting and dangerous. That is where the white power lies and that is where the heart of white racism is." In his usual fashion, Cox condemned suburbs, in general, and offered no specifics in proof of his assertions as to difficulty, excitement, or danger.)

Cox is especially beholden to the late King, who insisted that participation by the United States in the Vietnam War was immoral. King, of course, had no monopoly on this hypocritical judgment. It was adopted by Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam, in which Cox has been an activist. In February 1968, in a speech delivered to the "Concerned," Cox said: "Now, for the next two or three minutes, I am going to be skating on very thin legal ice. But let me say in no uncertain terms first, that in my considered and careful opinion, the war in Vietnam is unjust and immoral. It fails entirely on all the traditional counts as a just war – not just on one or two – and that, therefore, participation by a man of faith is an act which brings into grave jeopardy his conscience and his faith. This is my view, and I would urge you to come to your own view by reading and thinking and praying and making that decision. You must decide. But if you decide with an informed conscience and an illuminated conscience, that you cannot participate in this war, I hereby aid, counsel and abet you not to participate in that war."

In October 1968, Cox traveled to Sweden under the auspices of Clergy and Laymen Concerned. With other leftwingers, he wanted to let the Swedish authorities know how grateful his "pacifist" group was toward them for harboring American deserters and draft-evaders. To the young American criminals, Cox brought his pastoral greetings and concern: "We miss these young men in America. We need them and we hope some day many of them will return; but in the meantime we are profoundly thankful to the Swedish people for welcoming them and for sharing with them the hospitality of this generous and civilized land." (Cox did not mention that Sweden – "this generous and civilized land" – was a staunch financial and spiritual supporter of the North Vietnam Communists who were at war with other young American men, who were also missed but would never return to their homes.)

The revolutionaries of the streets and campuses have received the same degree of Cox's solicitude as the misfits in Sweden. Cox is a member of the Committee to Defend the Conspiracy, on behalf of the leaders who disrupted the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. As for the campus turmoil of recent years, Cox, as might be expected, blames "society" for having caused a moral, educational, and political crisis in the universities: "It is the consequence of those long years in which we neglected a fatal infection that was beginning to poison the university and transform it, under the same name, into something else. I am personally grateful that the current generation of students would not allow this debilitating disease to proceed any further."

In 1969, at the annual conference of United Press International's editors and publishers, Cox also resorted to meandering generalities to criticize the universities (in general, of course) and, at the same time, to strike a blow for pacifism, for the "poor," and for "student unrest": "Universities have begun to abandon their roles as independent centers of critical inquiry and have become increasingly subservient to outside interests. Especially dangerous to the freedom of the university is its subservience to such agencies as the defense department, the CIA, and various other organs of federal power. Oceans of money have flowed in from these sources and from the foundations." – The university is a community that "transcends national borders and loyalties" and has its highest loyalty to truth itself. "Yet in recent years the university has allowed itself to become a subcontractor to national interests. In my view, no research whatever directed toward mere national security should go on at a university." – "To the poor and powerless who live close to them, universities often appear as cruel and insensitive land-grabbers who put their own institutional interests above those of their neighbors." – "Until America resigns its recently assumed role as global policeman and counter-insurgency force, and either puts its resources on the side of fundamental social change in the hungry world, or at least does not support the exploiters, student unrest will continue. And in my own view, it should continue."

ALAN CRANSTON was born on June 19, 1914 in Palo Alto, California, son of Carol Dixon and William Cranston. He married Geneva McMath. He attended Pomona College (1932-1933) and the University of Mexico (summer, 1935). He is an alumnus of Stanford University (B.A., 1936).

Over a span of twenty years, various biographical sketches of Cranston allege that he was a foreign correspondent for International News Service from 1936 until 1938. One such sketch in *World Government News* said of Cranston: "Picking up languages as he went, he was a foreign correspondent for *International News Service,* covering England, Germany, Italy and Mussolini's rape of Ethiopia." The *INS* denied that Cranston was ever its correspondent in either Germany or Italy. As for England, he was an apprentice there, but so brief and minor was this service that "no employment record was ever kept on Cranston."

By 1939, Cranston was in New York City, where he engaged in some free-lance writing and lecturing. Before the end of the year, he was in Washington, D.C., where he worked for Louis Adamic's Common Council for American Unity and wrote for Adamic's publication, *Common Ground.* The Common Council was a leftwing lobby. (Adamic, a pet Communist of Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt, would later become either a suicide or the victim of ritualistic Communist liquidation.)

In December 1941, Cranston became chief of the foreign language division of the Office of Facts and Figures, which became Elmer Davis' Red-lined Office of War Information. When Cranston received his appointment to the OFF–OWI, he was investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which found that Cranston moved "in Communist circles" and that his "friends seemed to be fellow travelers . . . with Communist sympathies." (Cranston continued his friendship with Communist Louis Adamic, who used his connections in the OWI to promote the interests of Communist Josep Broz Tito in Adamic's native Yugoslavia.)

Working closely with Cranston in OWI's foreign language division was Carlo Emanuele a Prato (alias Perini, alias Duprez, alias Hono, alias Janota), who had been expelled from Switzerland as an agent of the Comintern and was described by the Criminal Alien Bureau of New York City's Police Department as "the payoff man for the OGPU [the Soviet Union's Secret Police]." An even closer associate of Cranston was his assistant chief David Karr (born Katz), formerly a shipping clerk, brush salesman, office boy, part-time writer for the Communists' *Daily Worker,* lecturer for the "subversive and Communist" American League against War and Fascism, and re-write man for the [Communist] *Party Organizer* – a position held only because he was "a trusted and powerful member of the Communist Party." (On April 6, 1943, Karr-Katz testified before the House Special Committee on Un-American Activities. He admitted that Alan Cranston, an old friend, was his sole sponsor for a job with the OFF-OWI. He also admitted that, although he was Cranston's assistant chief in the foreign language division of OWI, he could neither read nor speak any foreign language. Karr-Katz had the effrontery, during his testimony, to claim that "since 1938 I have been in constant touch with the Federal Bureau of Investigation . . . helped them develop a number of cases . . . [and] those cases consistently touched on Communist, Nazi, and Fascist activities in the United States." The FBI informed the Special Committee that Karr-Katz "had been to their offices once or twice, he was of no service to them, and they were not concerned with him one way or another as an informer." In 1943, Karr-Katz lost his job with the OWI. He found employment with an old friend, columnist Drew Pearson.)

In 1943, two congressional committees zeroed in on the OWI and Cranston was found to have been involved in pro-Soviet activities. Cranston, then twenty-nine years of age, was forced to leave OWI, which in effect meant that he lost his draft deferment. (In 1940, when Cranston was first eligible for the draft, he sent a three-page request to the New York Draft Board No. 16 for an occupational deferment because he was employed by the Common Council for American Unity "in reference to education and assimilation of the foreign born population in the United States.")

In 1944, Cranston entered the Army as a private. He soon became a sergeant, serving in the Information and Education Division, which was a haven for Communists, as the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee discovered during a series of hearings in 1954. In Cranston's brief army career, he was co-author of Army Talk – Orientation Fact Sheet No. 64, entitled *Fascism. Fascism* was a pro-Soviet, anti-American tract and typical of scores of other "Fact Sheets" in the series. It was reprinted in the Communists' *Daily Worker.* (Cranston's superior, Lt. Col. Julius Schreiber, was credited with the authorship of *Fascism.* Schreiber, when interrogated by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, said that he was not a Communist after 1940, but pleaded the Fifth Amendment when asked about his Communist Party record prior to 1941.)

The year 1945 was a very active one for Cranston. He was discharged from the army. His book, *The Killing of the Peace,* was published. (It recounted the history of the League of Nations, from 1916 until 1923, and it was bitterly critical of the United States for not joining the League. In *The Killing of the Peace,* Cranston acknowledged the editorial help he received from Denna F. Fleming of Vanderbilt University, one of the better known ultra-leftist advocates of internationalism and a persistent apologist for the Soviet Union.) He took a position as executive secretary for the Council of American-Italian Affairs, Inc. He became a director of the executive committee of Americans United for World Government. (The AUWG was riddled with veteran Communist-fronters, who prattled about a world federation of nations, world peace, and world citizenship.) In the fall of 1945, Cranston attended the Conference on World Government at Dublin, New Hampshire. (The Dublin Conference was convoked by Grenville Clark, who had written a draft for a global government in 1939. At his Dublin estate, Clark had forty-eight guests, most of whom were politically left and all of whom were oriented to pacifism and one-worldism.)

In February 1946, Cranston – representing the Dublin conferees – attended the London session of the United Nations. He presented to the UN delegates the Dublin Declaration, which proposed that the UN's General Assembly become a world legislature with power adequate to declare war.

In 1947, Cranston returned to his native California, where, among his other activities, he engaged in the real estate and home-building business for about twelve years. In the meantime, the Americans United for World Government merged with five other groups to form United World Federalists. In 1947, Cranston was head of the UWF chapter in San Francisco. In 1948, he was chairman of the Northern California branch of UWF. In 1949, he was elected national president of UWF and served three one-year terms in the position. (Since 1952, Cranston has been an honorary president of UWF.)

In 1953, Cranston founded and became president of the California Democratic Council. (He held the presidency until 1958, but even to the present time he has been the guiding power of the organization.) The CDC was a federation of Democratic Party clubs, and from its inception was the most extreme leftist Democratic group in the entire nation – so much so, that Communists in California were urged by their leaders to join the CDC and to support its program.

Over the years, Cranston's CDC has developed a program that has clung tenaciously to the Communist line on a variety of issues. As might be expected, the CDC advocates the globalist goals of United World Federalists. It advocates a world police force, more jurisdiction for the International Court of Justice, world disarmament, unilateral suspension of nuclear weapon-testing by the United States, appeasement of the Soviet Union by the United States, admission of Red China to the UN, the abolition of loyalty oaths, the abolition of capital punishment, the establishment of civilian "police review" boards, and nationalized-socialized health insurance programs. The CDC opposes the strengthening of laws against pornography and also opposes any legislation that would reduce the Supreme Court's powers in the area of civil "rights" cases.

With the CDC as a power base, Cranston in 1958 ran for political office for the first time and was elected as Controller of the State of California. In 1962, he was re-elected for a second four-year term. (Cranston's tenure as Controller was distinguished by financial chaos in California's government, but he tried strenuously to divert attention from his public duties by raising hysterical cries against alleged rightwing extremism, alleged anti-Semitism, and alleged neo-fascism, which he portrayed as threatening the existence of California. In his campaign of scaremongering, he proved to be a fulsome apologist for the highly defamatory Anti-Defamation League.)

In 1964, Cranston entered the Democratic primary race for the U.S. Senate. He lost to Pierre Salinger, who in turn was defeated in the election by Republican George Murphy. In 1966, Cranston was unsuccessful in his bid for a third term as Controller. In 1968, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, defeating Republican Max Rafferty.

In his first year in the Senate, Cranston was an unusually busy freshman. He introduced a number of unimaginative, liberal-oriented bills on civil rights (he boasts that he marched in Alabama with the late racist agitator Martin L. King Jr.), veterans' benefits, conservation, and agriculture (he is especially zealous to support the Communists' program to boycott California-grown table grapes). But his paramount concerns have been Red China and the Vietnam War. He is most anxious that the United States extend diplomatic recognition to Red China. To further this cause he has resurrected the idea that the Senate should resolve that diplomatic recognition "does not imply that the United States necessarily approves of the form, ideology or policy of that foreign government." (The *New York Times* hailed Cranston's fossilized ploy as "a new approach to [the] China problem.")

Cranston's views on the Vietnam War have not changed since 1968, when he said: "It is a moral outrage, a political failure and a military failure." At the same time he called for an immediate suspension of American bombing in North Vietnam and more reliance on the Paris "peace" talks. He has ranged himself with the most extreme doves in the Senate and has retained his fervor for world peace and world government in a style befitting the United World Federalists' most prominent spokesman in the Congress.

NORRIS DARRELL was born on January 30, 1899 in St. Kitts, British West Indies, son of Maria Pandt and Norris Darrell. He was brought to the United States in 1900 and was naturalized in 1910. He was married to the late Doris Williams. He is married to Mary Hand Churchill. He is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota. He was admitted to the Minnesota bar in 1923 and to the New York bar in 1927.

From 1923 until 1925, Darrell was legal secretary to Pierce Butler, associate justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Since 1925, he has been with the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell in New York City. (Notable members of the firm included the late Dulles brothers, John Foster and Allen.)

Darrell has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a technical advisor to the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy. He has been a national council member of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He is a member of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights under Law, formed at the behest of the Kennedy Dynasty (President John F. and Attorney General Robert F.) to provide legal assistance to racial agitators.

HOWARD da SILVA was born on May 4, 1909 in Cleveland, Ohio, son of Bertha Sen and Benjamin Silverblatt. He was married to and divorced from Marjorie Nelson. He is married to Nancy Nutter. In 1928, he attended the Carnegie Institute of Technology for one semester. Since 1929, he has been in the entertainment field, primarily as an actor but also as a director and producer. He has appeared on stage, in films, and on radio and television.

On March 21, 1951, da Silva testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. When interrogated about his affiliations with the Communist Party, Communists, and Communist fronts, he invoked the protection of the First and Fifth Amendments. (Marc Lawrence, under oath, testified that he had attended a Communist Party cell meeting with da Silva. Da Silva was identified under oath as a Communist by Martin Berkeley.) In the April-May 1951 issue of *Film Sense,* da Silva explained his actions before the HCUA in an article, "I Will Not Play The Informer."

Da Silva has been affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); Progressive Citizens of America ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the Voice of Freedom Committee (to defend pro-Communist radio speakers); the Committee for the Re-election of Benjamin J. Davis, a Communist; the Committee for Free Political Advocacy ("Communist front"); the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and "Soviet culture"); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Actors' Laboratory Theatre ("red front"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); the League of American Writers ("subversive and Communist"); and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups").

Da Silva engaged in the widespread Communist project urging clemency for the convicted atom-spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. He lectured at the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"). In 1960, he was a featured entertainer at the Republican Party's campaign kickoff jamboree, even though Republican leaders had been informed beforehand of his red affiliations.

In 1969, da Silva (who has yet to disavow his Red affiliations), while playing the role of Benjamin Franklin in the Broadway musical *1776*, was host to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson at the theatre. He presented Lady Bird with a souvenir copy of the Declaration of Independence!

On February 22, 1970, the musical *1776* was presented in the White House at President Nixon's request. Mr. Nixon and da Silva posed smiling for photographs that were widely reproduced in the nation's press.

JULES DASSIN was born on December 18, 1911 in Middletown, Connecticut, son of Berthe Vogel and Samuel Dassin. He was married to and divorced from Beatrice Launer. He is married to Melina Mercouri.

In Dassin's early working years, he was an actor in little-theater groups and a radio writer. In the late 1930's he became a Hollywood film director. In 1951, two of Dassin's Hollywood colleagues, Edward Dmytryk and Frank Tuttle, both of whom admitted that they had been members of the Communist Party, testified under oath that they had known Dassin to be a Communist. Dassin was subpoenaed to testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, but for reasons that have never been made public his appearance was twice postponed. In 1952, he went to Europe, where he produced and directed films in France and Greece.

During the 1950's, in leftwing circles, Dassin was treated as a martyr – a victim of the so-called Hollywood blacklist against those whose affiliations with the Communist Party and Communist fronts had become a matter of public record. At the same time, Dassin was receiving acclaim for his film work in Europe.

By 1960, Dassin found that the so-called blacklist had faded away. His film, *Never on Sunday*, made in Greece, was given a special screening at the headquarters and theater of the Screen Directors Guild in Hollywood. A sympathetic account of the affair ("Hollywood Turns," by Murray Schumach) appeared in the *New York Times* of October 16, 1960. Wrote Schumach: "How very odd this latest party at the

Screen Directors Guild really was became evident in a story told the day after the celebration by Mr. Dassin, a small, restless man with eager eyes and a mobile face, who wrote, directed and acted in the movie. 'About a year and a half ago,' Mr. Dassin said, 'before the opening of my picture, *He Who Must Die,* invitations went out to all the fine gentlemen of Hollywood for the same sort of screening – exactly the same.' That film, he interspersed parenthetically, had been made in Greece. As a member of the blacklist he could not have made a film in Hollywood then.

" 'I was amazed, therefore,' he [Dassin] resumed, 'to see that the R.S.V.P.'s showed that nearly everyone was coming. And then came the day of the preview. It was as though a secret button had been pushed. Hordes of men suddenly discovered unavoidable dinner engagements. There was this inexplicable epidemic of grippe and high fever. Of all my director friends – and I have friends – one came. Just one.' "

Dassin told Schumach that between 1958 and 1960, there had been a change in the intellectual climate of Hollywood. The blacklist was "in the throes of its last agonies." Studio executives and actors were friendly toward Dassin once again. And Schumach found Dassin in a forgiving mood. (In the October 24, 1960 issue of *Newsweek* there was also a sympathetic portrait of Dassin.)

In the 1960's, Dassin experienced no difficulty in getting his European-made films exhibited in the United States, but in the eyes of some he still wore a mantle of martyrdom. In the January 25, 1969 issue of the *Saturday Evening Post,* John Skow wrote ("Uptight!"): "The Hollywood blacklist of the early '50's had his name on it. He had been a member of the Communist Party in the late '30's, and although he had left it in 1939, that was not good enough in the years of Joseph McCarthy's witch hunts."

Of course, the late Senator Joseph McCarthy had nothing to do with Dassin's trials and tribulations. Dassin's old comrades, Dmytryk and Tuttle, had identified him as a Communist before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and Dassin had not sought an opportunity to refute those allegations.

Skow's admission that Dassin was a member of the Communist Party was not startling, but Skow never did explain how he was privy to the fact that Dassin left the party in 1939. If such a separation had occurred, Dassin's affiliations after 1939 require some explanation. Three years after Dassin's alleged break with the Communist Party, he was a sponsor of the Artists' Front to Win the War, a Communist front that was saturated with notorious Communists and fellow travelers. In 1948, nine years after his alleged break, Dassin was on the executive board of the Actors' Laboratory, which according to California's Senate Fact-finding Committee on Un-American Activities was a "Communist venture." In 1949, ten years after his alleged break, Dassin sponsored the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace – a Communist front set up to "mobilize American intellectuals in the field of arts, sciences and letters" as a propaganda forum for Soviet foreign policy and "Soviet culture."

Dassin's second marriage has also been tinged a deep Red. Melina Mercouri, the actress daughter of a leftwing Greek politician, was deprived of her Greek citizenship in 1967 because of her activities against the anti-Communist regime in Greece. Since that time, the Dassins have become favored personalities in Communist circles and in the Communist press in Europe and the United States. If Jules Dassin ever really broke with the Communist Party, the treatment accorded him subsequently by the Communists is a unique and exceptional example of forgiveness to a renegade.

WILLIAM C. DAVIDON was born on March 18, 1927 in Florida, son of Ruth Simon and Jack Davidon. His second wife is Ann Morrissett. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago (B.S., M.S., Ph.D.).

From 1948 until 1954, he was employed by the Nuclear Chicago Company. From 1954 until 1956, he was a research associate at the Fermi Institute of the University of Chicago. From 1956 until 1961, he was an associate physicist at the Argonne National Laboratory. In 1958, he was a visiting associate professor at the University of Washington. Since 1961, he has been at Haverford College: as associate professor of physics (1961-1969), and since 1969, as professor of physics and chairman of the physics department. In 1967, he participated in the seventeenth Pugwash Conference of scientists and government officials from the United States and the Soviet Union.

In 1966 and 1967, Davidon was a Fulbright research scholar. On June 17, 1966, the *Birmingham* [Ala.] *Post-Herald,* in a special dispatch from its Washington bureau, reported: "Peacenik professor William Davidon has been officially warned that his $8000 Fulbright Fellowship is for study and not to provide him a chance to lobby against the Viet Nam war.

"The Post-Herald learned that the warning came two weeks ago in a letter to Davidon from the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which selects recipients of Fulbright Fellowship Grants.

"The warning was an unprecedented step on the part of the 12-member board, a State Department spokesman said.

"Davidon, of Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., was one of a number of citizens who declared recently that they would not pay all or part of their federal income tax because they didn't want to help finance American participation in the war.

"And he was a member of a group of Americans who later were expelled from Viet Nam when they tried to launch an anti-war demonstration in Saigon.

"All this brought an outcry from Congress that his Fulbright Grant for a year's study in Denmark should be cancelled. The Board of Foreign Scholarships refused.

"The State Department said that the board's letter to Davidon cautioned the professor that if he used the Fulbright Grant for 'purposes other than academic pursuit, the grant would be reviewed for possible cancellation.' "

Prior to his Fulbright days, Davidon had an active history of leftwing activities. He had been a contributor to David Dellinger's pro-Communist *Liberation* magazine. He had been a long-time sponsor of the ultra-leftist, pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He had been a national committeeman of the ultra-leftist, pacifist Committee for Nonviolent Action. He had been vice chairman in 1960 and 1961 of the Federation of American Scientists, a group of bleeding-heart, leftwing pacifists. In 1961, he engaged in a pro-Communist project by petitioning against an American invasion of Communist Cuba, and he also petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to

Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, who had been convicted for contempt of Congress. He signed a "Declaration of Conscience" sponsored by the *Catholic Worker,* the Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Student Peace Union, and the War Resisters League – all leftist-pacifist. (The Declaration said: "We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development.")

On April 29, 1962, the mid-west edition of the Communists' *Worker* described Davidon as "a Chicago favorite" because of his "peace" activities. In 1962, he led a two-day "peace" march in Chicago and received favorable notices in the Communists' *New World Review* and the *Worker.*

Davidon has been affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the leftist-pacifist American Friends Service Committee; and the leftist-pacifist Student Peace Union. In 1962, he gained publicity by announcing his intention to emigrate to New Zealand or some other foreign land in order that "so much of my time will not be taken up in opposing the government's drive to destroy the earth." He recanted his threat, however, and decided to "bring SSRS concerns to the attention of science students at colleges and universities." (The SSRS – the Society for Social Responsibility in Science – is an ultra-leftist, pacifist group which Davidon has served as a member, vice president, council member, and president.) In the mid-1960's he became an activist in the leftist anti-Vietnam War teach-ins.

OSSIE DAVIS was born on December 18, 1917 in Cogdell, Georgia, son of Laura Cooper and Kince Davis. He married Ruby Wallace (stage name: Ruby Dee). From 1935 until 1938, he was a student at Howard University. For several years he worked as a shipping clerk.

In 1941, Davis began his career in the entertainment field. He has been an actor, director, scriptwriter, and producer. He has appeared on the stage, in films, and on television.

Davis has been affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front"); *New World Review* ("Communist publication"); *Morning Freiheit* ("Communist publication"); Camp Midvale (Communist Party enterprise); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); *Freedomways* magazine (leftwing); the American Peace Crusade ("Communist front"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the Association of Artists for Freedom (leftwing); the Liberation Committee for Africa (leftwing); the Monroe Defense Committee (on behalf of the leftist-racist Robert F. Williams); the Alexander Defense Committee (on behalf of leftist-racist agitators in South Africa); and the Charter Group for a Pledge of Conscience (on behalf of six who conspired to murder a woman shopkeeper in Harlem).

Davis was a eulogist at funeral services for Malcolm X, a leading racial agitator. He was chairman of a memorial tribute to W.E.B. DuBois, a Communist. He agitated on behalf of the atom spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg and Morton Sobell. He attended a rally in honor of the Communist revolutionary Ché Guevara.

In the political arena, Davis endorsed the New York City mayoralty candidacy of William Fitts Ryan, an ultra-leftist. He participated in the Voters' Pledge Campaign for "peace" candidates in 1966. He was a member of the National Conference for New Politics, a third-party movement largely controlled by the Communists. He was the keynote speaker at the founding convention of the Freedom and Peace Party, which ran Communist candidates for the presidency and lesser offices in 1968.

As a leftwing peacenik, Davis was affiliated with the 1965 March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam, the 1965 Ad Hoc Committee of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, the 1966 Sing-In for Peace Concert at Carnegie Hall, and the 1966 Read-In for Peace in Vietnam at New York's Town Hall.

In the area of racial agitation, Davis has been affiliated with the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

RENNARD C. DAVIS was born on May 23, 1940 in Lansing, Michigan. He is an alumnus of Oberlin College (B.A., 1962). He pursued graduate studies at the University of Illinois (1964), the University of Michigan (1965), and the University of Chicago.

On December 3, 1968, Davis testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which was investigating "subversive involvement in disruption of 1968 Democratic Party National Convention." When he was asked what type of employment he had held, Davis replied: "Essentially I have been employed by what we have been calling loosely this morning the movement since early 1960. And I think it is misleading to talk about my formal education as being the important education. My education came from having a cigarette ground out in the back of my neck in the South, trying to get a hamburger with a black man. My education came with working with people from Kentucky, West Virginia, Alabama, and South Carolina who moved to Chicago thinking they could get a better deal there, only to find they were confronted with railroads who wanted to steal rents and fix up apartments in no way at all or caseworkers who live in the suburbs and made literally life-and-death decisions over their lives, and they had no recourse in making those decisions. You know my background, and essentially my work has been in neighborhoods, in communities in this country, trying to work around those kinds of grievances. That has been the basic employment of the past, and I hope for the future."

In 1964 and 1965, Davis was the director of the SDS Economic Research and Action Project. He explained: "In 1964 Students for a Democratic Society [of which Davis was a founder] established a community organizing program that was aimed at trying to bring people into black and poor white communities, to develop new political centers of power that could allow individuals who are victims of police brutality or welfare bureaucracy or slum landlords or loan sharks to have an organization that they could use for their own rights and their own grievances." Davis' ERAP established ten organizing projects in 1964.

In 1965, Davis settled in Chicago, where he became a member of JOIN Community Union. He testified of the organization: "The purpose of JOIN was to attempt to see if the kinds of people that Mr. Watson [Representative Albert Watson (R.-S.C.), a member of the HCUA] claims to represent and that [former Alabama Governor George] Wallace claimed to speak for could, in fact, if organized around their own grievances and their own problems, begin to understand that they have a relationship to the black community and the problems of the black community and that, in fact, it is the movement that has begun in the black community that makes the most sense as an ultimate solution, power solution to the problems of poor whites in this country." Davis worked for nearly three years with residents of Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky in JOIN Community Union.

In 1967, Davis became the director of the Center for Radical Research, which he described as "a research project that was aimed at supplying intelligence and information to various community groups across Chicago that would be useful in making their challenge to an incredibly corrupt from top down political machine represented publicly by Mayor Daley." In fact, Davis admitted that the Center for Radical Research had as one of its projects the identification of plain-clothes officers who were part of the Chicago Police Department. He was worried that the police had infiltrated some of his activities or would do so. He said: "One of the concerns of people who are trying to build a democratic society in this country is how to operate democratically when your meetings are infiltrated and reports are written that distort your purposes and then used against you. It seemed to us that the first step in dealing with this problem was to identify who those agents might be."

In the fall of 1967, Davis went to Bratislava, Czecho-Slovakia, to attend a conference between about forty American radicals and their North Vietnamese counterparts. The conference was arranged by two of Davis' revolutionary comrades, David Dellinger and Thomas Hayden.

At Bratislava, the Communists from North Vietnam invited Davis to visit their homeland. Davis told the HCUA: "At that conference, invitation was extended to me to see firsthand what had been talked about at Bratislava through a trip to North Vietnam. I went essentially at that time, October 1967, to North Vietnam to try to document, if I could, the widespread use of antipersonnel weapons or cluster bomb units in that country . . . [and] I attempted to go to study bomb damage and the type of [American] experimental weapons used in Hanoi to bring that information back to the United States, since the United States military – and through the press – was patently lying about what has happened in that country."

When Davis returned to the United States from North Vietnam, he spent several months speaking and propagandizing on behalf of the North Vietnamese. Then, in April 1968, he turned his energies toward the formation of Summer of Support, an organization for establishing coffeehouses near army bases throughout the United States. By December 1968, six such coffeehouses were in operation. They were designed to attract servicemen and expose them to pacifist propaganda.

In his testimony to the HCUA, Davis

vigorously denied that Summer of Support and its coffeehouses encouraged disaffection and desertion from the Army. Instead, he clothed himself in a mantle of altruism when he talked about the purpose of the coffeehouses: "As a young person myself, I feel a particular sympathy for those Americans who have been drafted into the Armed Forces and given orders to fight and die in a war that, in the interests of this country, cannot be tolerated or supported. I happen to believe that as someone who is very committed to peace in that country that I represent a major ally of the average GI . . . . "

Davis explained the "ally" he represented: "Young people and others in this country who have organized and worked and raised the issue of the war in public arenas from coast to coast. In other words, the peace movement, it seems to me, not the Congressmen who sit here, who are for the war, represent the major supporters of American fighting men, and Summer Support was essentially a program to dramatize and focus in a very specific way the support of the peace movement for American soldiers."

Davis realized that overt proselytizing of GIs by leftwing pacifists in the coffeehouses could result in serious legal difficulties. Therefore, he resorted to subtle means of encouraging desertions – even mutinies: "If GIs decide to organize themselves to do whatever they feel they want to do, we may counsel them very strongly about the legal problems they may face if they take certain actions." (Eight months after Davis testified before the HCUA, he threw reticence aside at a Chicago rally and described what "certain actions" he hoped would be taken by GIs: "The reason we are here tonight is to try to figure out how we can get the kind of *mutiny* that Company A started in South Viet Nam and spread it to every army base . . . . ")

During the period when Davis was organizing Summer of Support, he was also busy with preparations to disrupt the proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, to be held at Chicago in August 1968. Davis' role in the Chicago demonstrations was that of co-project director, with Thomas Hayden, of the National Mobilization Committee. (Davis and Hayden were appointed by David Dellinger, Mobe's chairman. Mobe was the dominant coordinating force of groups that included Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panther Party, the Communist Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Youth International Party [Yippies]. Davis admitted that he "was interested in a demonstration at the Democratic Convention as early as October of 1967 and began to go to various meetings to raise that possibility as early as December of 1967.")

The preparations for the Chicago demonstrations began as early as January 1968. Davis was involved in the preparations from that time until the Democratic Convention began in late August. He was directly involved in the actual demonstrations, which were later described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as follows: "Demonstrations held during the convention period included taunting of the police: they were referred to as 'pigs,' they were spat upon, obscenities were shouted at them and they were the targets of all kinds of unbelievable abuse; on several occasions undisciplined mobs intent on marching to the convention site without legal authority had to be repulsed by the police and National Guard. Reportedly many of the hippies used drugs regularly.

"The demonstrations resulted in mass

arrests. Also, there were numerous police and demonstrators injured. Approximately 650 arrests were made by local authorities and nearly 200 police officers were injured during the confrontations with the demonstrators. It has been estimated that more than 900 persons obtained emergency treatment for injuries received during the disorder." (Dellinger had promised, "We will make our presence dramatically and militantly felt.")

On March 20, 1969, Davis and seven of his cohorts were indicted by a federal grand jury at Chicago. Among the counts charged against Davis was "that during the period beginning on or about July 20, 1968 through on or about August 1, 1968, Rennard C. Davis . . . did travel in interstate commerce from outside the State of Illinois to Chicago, Illinois . . . with intent to incite, organize, promote and encourage a riot and, thereafter, on or about August 1 . . . August 9 . . . August 18 . . . and on or about August 26 . . . he did speak to assemblages of persons for the purpose of inciting, organizing, promoting and encouraging a riot."

Davis and his co-defendants decided to call themselves "The Conspiracy," and invited others "to join a conspiracy of people against the forces that brought us Vietnam, the ABM, racism, high taxes, unemployment, hunger, political machines and a corporate system that exalts private profit and property over human needs." (A "Committee to Defend the Conspiracy" was immediately formed to solicit political and financial support for Davis and his co-defendants. Rallying for "The Conspiracy" were the usual letterhead performers, along with some newcomers: Julian Bond, Leonard Bernstein, Noam Chomsky, Congressmen John Conyers Jr. and Don Edwards, Judy Collins, Harvey Cox, Ossie Davis and his wife Ruby Dee, Jules Feiffer, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Sidney Lens, Helen Lynd, Dwight Macdonald, Norman Mailer, Stewart Meacham, Marcus Raskin, Pete Seeger, Tom Smothers, Albert Szent-Györgyi, Benjamin Spock, I.F. Stone, Harold Taylor, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn.)

The trial of "The Conspiracy" began on September 24, 1969, in the federal district court of Chicago. The jury, on February 18, 1970, found Davis guilty of violating the anti-riot provision of the 1968 Civil Rights Act by crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. He was sentenced to five years' imprisonment, fined $5,000, and assessed for a share of the costs of prosecution. The presiding judge also found Davis in contempt of court and sentenced him to two years, one month, and eighteen days in prison.

The Chicago demonstrations were not the end of Davis' radical activities. He was deeply involved in the preparations for the so-called Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations of October and November 1969. Also in 1969, he re-visited North Vietnam and returned to the United States singing the praises of the North Vietnamese and threatening revolution in the United States: "We've got to make it clear that the secret weapon ["a revolutionary people"] is exploding in the United States. When Nixon can travel nowhere in this country except the military bases and even there he may get a demonstration, let it be known that the secret weapon is behind the enemy [American] lines. When this entire generation refuses any longer to do anything but repudiate, spit on, and throw things at every single American whose life is invested in the service of the privileged and the military, let it be clear that the secret weapon is exploding behind the enemy lines."

GARDINER M. DAY was born on February 22, 1900 in Staten Island, New York, son of Mary Copelin and Nathaniel Day. He married Katharine Bennett. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1922), Columbia University (M.A., 1925), and Episcopal Theological School of Massachusetts (B.D., 1926). In 1925, he was ordained to the ministry of the Episcopal Church. He is the author of *Old Wine in New Bottles* (1949); *The Biography of a Church* (1952); *The Lord's Prayer* (1954); *Christ Speaks from the Cross* (1955); and *The Apostles' Creed* (1963).

In 1925 and 1926, Day was minister-in-charge at the Church of the Good Shepherd in Boston. From 1926 until 1929, he was an assistant minister at Trinity Church in Boston. From 1929 until 1936, he was at St. John's Church in Williamstown, Massachusetts, as associate minister (1929-1930) and rector (1930-1936). From 1936 until 1941, he was the rector of St. Stephen's Church in Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania. From 1941 until 1966, he was the rector of Christ Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Since 1967, he has been an honorary associate of Grace Church in Manchester, New Hampshire.

From 1952 until 1968, Day was a fellow of the Yale University Corporation. Since 1953, he has been on the board of directors of the Union Theological Seminary, a hotbed of radical-leftist clergymen. He has been active in the leftist Massachusetts Council of Churches as: director (1948-1950); vice president (1954-1966); and member of the general board (1957-1966). He has also been active in the equally leftist National Council of Churches and the New Hampshire Council of Churches. He has been an official of the radical and leftist Civil Liberties Union of Massachusetts.

Other affiliations of Day include: the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism ("Communist front"); and the National Religion and Labor Foundation (Communist-infiltrated). He has also joined in Communist projects to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to get legal relief for such leftwing warhorses as William Howard Melish and Harry Bridges, and to gain amnesty for convicted Communist Party leaders Henry Winston and Gil Green.

RUBY DEE was born Ruby Ann Wallace, *circa* 1920, in Cleveland, Ohio, daughter of Emma Benson and Marshall Wallace. She married Ossie Davis. She is an alumna of Hunter College (B.A., *circa* 1941). From 1941 until 1944, she studied acting at the American Negro Theatre School. As an actress, she has appeared on the stage, in films, and on television.

Ruby Dee has joined her husband, Ossie Davis, in many of his leftwing activities. She has been affiliated with *Monthly Review* (a pro-Communist publication); *Freedomways* magazine (leftwing); Camp Midvale (Communist Party enterprise); the Association of Artists for Freedom (leftwing); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American

Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing, pacifist); the Liberation Committee for Africa (leftwing); the Alexander Defense Committee (on behalf of leftist-racist agitators in South Africa); and the Monroe Defense Committee (on behalf of the leftist-racist agitator Robert F. Williams). She joined in a memorial tribute to W.E.B. DuBois, a Communist.

In the political arena, Ruby Dee endorsed the New York City mayoralty candidacy of William Fitts Ryan, an ultra-leftist. She participated in the Voters' Pledge Campaign for "peace" candidates in 1966.

As a leftwing peacenik, Ruby Dee was affiliated with the 1965 March on Washington for Peace in Vietnam, the 1966 Sing-In for Peace Concert at Carnegie Hall, and the 1966 Read-In for Peace in Vietnam at New York's Town Hall.

In the area of racial agitation, Ruby Dee has been affiliated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Congress of Racial Equality.

OSCAR de LIMA was born on April 16, 1898 in New York City, son of Rosalynde Abenun and Oscar de Lima. He was married to the late Natalie Rogers. He is married to Suzanne Hume. He is an alumnus of Massachusetts Institute of Technology (B.S., 1919) and Harvard University (B.S., 1919).

From 1919 until 1925, de Lima was a mining engineer. From 1925 until 1928, he was in the construction business. In 1928, he entered the hotel business. From 1931 until 1962, he was president of the Roger Smith Hotels Corporation, and since 1962, he has been chairman of the corporation's board of directors. Over the years, he has also been an officer and/or director of various other business enterprises.

From 1946 until 1964, de Lima was with the American Association for the United Nations: director and executive committee member (1946-1964); executive vice president (1951-1957); acting president (1957-1958); chairman of the board of governors (1952-1954); chairman of the board of directors (1954-1958); chairman of the executive committee (1960-1964). In 1964, the AAUN became the United Nations Association of the United States, and since 1964, de Lima has been chairman of the executive committee of the UNAUS. (The UNAUS [and its predecessor AAUN] has served as a propaganda organization for the United Nations, for one-worldism, for disarmament, and for admission of Red China to UN membership. Its officers, advisors, members, and sponsors have included representatives of the far-left wing of the Democrat Party, the most extreme group of "modern" Republicans, the Red China lobby, and the left wing of organized labor; leaders of leftwing political groups and pacifist organizations; leftwing clergy; soft-on-Communism State Department functionaries; executives of foundations that have made substantial contributions to the socialization of the United States; disarmament fanatics; inveterate Communist fronters; and vociferous anti-anti-Communists. Among de Lima's associates in the AAUN-UNAUS have been Eugenie Anderson, Roger Baldwin, Doak Barnett, Detlev Bronk, Ralph Bunche, James B. Carey, Benjamin V. Cohen, Andrew Cordier, Joseph E. Davies, Arthur H. Dean, Helen Gahagan Douglas, John Foster Dulles, Albert Einstein, Luther Evans, John K. Fairbank, Thomas J. Finletter, Arthur Goldberg, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Frank P. Graham, Ernest Gross, Alger Hiss, Paul Hoffman, Hubert Humphrey, Philip Jessup, Joseph E. Johnson, Grayson Kirk, Arthur Larson, Owen Lattimore, Herbert Lehman, Sol Linowitz, G. Bernard Noble, James G. Patton, Nathaniel Peffer, Jacob Potofsky, Edwin O. Reischauer, Walter Reuther, Eleanor and Anna Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Adlai Stevenson, Rex Stout, Charles P. Taft, James J. Wadsworth, Sumner Welles, and Charles W. Yost.

Among de Lima's other efforts to promote the United Nations has been his work with the UN Guide Service and the Speaker Services for the UN. He was a member of the drafting committee and executive committee of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, the research arm of the UNAUS, and was a delegate to the national conference of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

De Lima has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States); the Foreign Policy Association (the Foreign Policy Association has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism. It has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists); and the National Council for Civic Responsibility (Arthur Larson's anti-anti-Communist group, which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation).

DAVID DELLINGER was born on August 12, 1915 in Wakefield, Massachusetts, son of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Dellinger. He is married. In 1936, he graduated from Yale University, where he had majored in economics. After Yale, he attended New College at Oxford University in England. After a year at Oxford, he returned to Yale where he became the graduate secretary of a Christian student association.

In 1939, Dellinger enrolled at the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. Before, during, and since Dellinger's brief stay there, Union has been notorious as being dominated – administration, faculty, and student body – by Communists, fellow travelers, dupes of Communists, and run-of-the-mill leftwingers. Union's alumni have been as well-known for their leftwing political activities as for their deviations from orthodox Protestantism, regardless of their denomination.

In 1940, while still a bachelor, Dellinger refused to register for the draft. He was subsequently convicted and sent to the federal prison at Danbury, Connecticut. In 1943, in Connecticut, he refused to report for a physical examination required for induction into military service. He subsequently served two years in the federal penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania. In 1949, he was apprehended while performing a lewd act in a men's room in New York City. He was convicted and received a suspended sentence.

Dellinger next came into the news in 1950. At that time he lived on a communal farm at Glen Gardner, New Jersey. When the Korean War started, he, his wife, and some friends, posing as pacifists, staged a two-week hunger strike in opposition to the war.

In 1951, Dellinger announced his intention to cycle from Paris to Moscow. He said that he would tell young Russians to resist army service. His would-be advice was not appreciated by Soviet officials and the cycling trip ended in Baden, Austria, which at that time was occupied by Soviet forces.

In 1956, Dellinger founded *Liberation* magazine. Over the years, he has been owner, publisher, and editor. He has made the magazine, since its beginnings, an outlet for Communist and pro-Communist propaganda and leftwing pacifism, and – in general – a viciously anti-American vehicle. Communist Party officials Benjamin Davis and Gil Green have written for *Liberation.* Extreme leftwingers who have contributed articles and/or held editorial positions in *Liberation* include: Waldo Frank, Arthur Waskow, Harvey Wheeler, Martin L. King Jr., Sidney Lens, Paul Jacobs, Bayard Rustin, Milton Mayer, Dagmar Wilson, Erich Fromm, W.H. Ferry, Tom Hayden, Paul Goodman, James Peck, James Baldwin, and Michael Harrington. They represent a cross-section of important Socialists, Communist-fronters, revolutionary racist agitators, and extreme leftwing pacifists. (*Liberation* has frequently advertised for subscribers in *National Guardian* – now known as the *Guardian* – which has been unmistakably Communist in its character throughout its history.)

In public records, Dellinger does not appear as an inveterate joiner of Communist fronts. However, he has been involved in Communist causes and projects and he has associated with Communists in the United States and abroad. (As a frame of reference: In 1967, Dellinger was asked – not under oath: "Are you now or have you ever been a Communist?" He replied: "I have never at any time in my life belonged to a political party. At one time when I was in college, I belonged to the Young People's Socialist League [of the Socialist Party]. I've grown more militant since then." On another occasion, Dellinger described himself as a "non-Soviet" Communist. He did not amplify this statement.)

Dellinger's magazine, *Liberation,* has been an important outlet for Communist Fidel Castro's propaganda. In his pro-Castro activities, Dellinger was a member of the Castro-financed Fair Play for Cuba Committee. (Another member of FPCC was Lyle Stuart. Dellinger contributed articles to Stuart's leftwing publication, *The Independent.*) Dellinger sponsored a rally in honor of Ernest "Ché" Guevara, Castro's principal hatchet-man. He was a member of the Medical Aid to Cuba Committee, which was saturated with Communists and fellow travelers. In 1963, he sponsored and participated in the so-called Quebec-Washington-Guantanamo Walk and was arrested during that demonstration. The purpose of the "Walk" was two-fold: (1) it propagandized for free trade between the United States and Communist Cuba; (2) it propagandized for unilateral disarmament by the United States.

Dellinger has been a very active member of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (which now prefixes its title with the word "National"), a Communist front. In 1965, he spoke at a so-called teach-in on "civil liberties." The teach-in was sponsored by the ECLC, and speakers featured on the same program as Dellinger included Archie Brown, James Aronson, and Henry Abrams – all of whom are Communists. Dellinger has also been a member of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, which was "created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party."

Dellinger has been a member of the Monroe Defense Committee (on behalf of leftist-racist Robert F. Williams); the

Alexander Defense Committee (on behalf of leftist-racist agitators in South Africa); the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee (on behalf of three who evaded service in Vietnam); Bertrand Russell's "war crimes tribunal" (an international anti-United States spectacle engineered by Communists); and the American Forum for Socialist Education (literally saturated with Communists). In 1965, he was an honored guest at the Communists' *National Guardian* dinner. In the same year, he sent greetings to the annual banquet of the Communists' *Worker.* Also in 1965, he supported the Declaration of Conscience, sponsored by the *Catholic Worker,* the Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Student Peace Union, and the War Resisters League – all in the leftwing-pacifist camp. The Declaration said: "We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development."

In 1965 and 1966, respectively, Dellinger received nation-wide attention as leader of the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade in New York City and the demonstration by the Assembly of Unrepresented People in Washington, D.C. Both demonstrations combined racial agitation and anti-Vietnam War agitation.

In 1967, Dellinger joined in a tribute to an old-line Red, Abraham J. Muste. The tribute was sponsored by the leftwing-pacifist Committee for Nonviolent Action, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the War Resisters League, and Dellinger's own *Liberation* magazine.

In 1966, Dellinger traveled to Moscow, Red China, and Hanoi. He remained fifteen days in North Vietnam, where he visited with Ho chi Minh. When Dellinger concluded his trip, he spread the Communist line, saying that the bombing by United States forces in North Vietnam had stiffened North Vietnam's resolve to fight. Dellinger's passport was picked up by United States authorities because of his illegal visit to Hanoi. (Dellinger's account of his Hanoi trip was advertised in the Communists' *National Guardian.*) In 1967, Dellinger retrieved his passport. It was reported that he had promised not to revisit North Vietnam; but in May 1967, he again went to North Vietnam, and again his passport was picked up by United States authorities.

In November 1966, the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam was formed. (Its predecessor was the November 8 Mobilization Committee for Peace in Vietnam, for Human Rights, and for Economic Justice.) Dellinger was a vice chairman of the Spring Mobilization Committee. Fellow officials included Edward Keating of *Ramparts* magazine, which had featured viciously dishonest criticism of the United States and South Vietnam in their respective and joint war efforts; Ralph Abernathy, the leftwing, racist, revolutionary agitator; Dagmar Wilson, founder and leader of Women Strike for Peace, a leftwing-pacifist group that unquestionably has given considerable aid and comfort to the international Communists in their phony peace movement; and James Bevel, an official of the late Martin L. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference, who has been in his own right a demagogic and revolutionary racist agitator.

The Spring Mobilization Committee, according to *Challenge* magazine – a publication of the Progressive Labor

Party and a mouthpiece for Red China – was a "coalition of Communist Party revisionists, Trotskyites (of the Socialist Workers Party – Young Socialist variety), and liberal pacifists." Vice chairman Dellinger, despite his characterization of himself as a non-Soviet Communist, could not deny that the SMC had the full and public support of the beholden-to-Moscow Communist Party of the United States, speaking through its official publications and some of its better-known comrades, including Arnold Johnson, Ben Dobbs, Bettina Aptheker, James R. Lindsay, Albert J. Lima, and Al Richmond.

The SMC's 1967 demonstration in New York City featured such well-known racist agitators as Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, and the late Martin L. King Jr. The demonstration was especially important, however, because the racist agitators, besides their phony protests about civil rights, tied those protests to anti-Vietnam War propaganda. Under this dual-purpose situation, the anti-war, leftwing-pacifist crowd was represented by Benjamin Spock, Linus Pauling, Mrs. William O. Douglas (the young and latest wife of the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court), Mrs. Drew Pearson (wife of the late columnist, who had been such a close friend of Tito, Khrushchev, and Earl Warren), Mrs. Henry Reuss (wife of the Wisconsin Congressman, one of the leading radicals in the House of Representatives), Dagmar Wilson of Women Strike for Peace, and Mrs. Cyrus Eaton (wife of the obnoxious industrialist whose close friends have included Khrushchev, Kosygin, Brezhnev, Fidel Castro, Mikoyan, and the leaders of North Vietnam). Simultaneous with the New York City demonstration was another held in San Francisco.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities described the SMC's 1967 demonstrations as "a 'crash program' to undermine and sabotage U.S. resistance to Communist military aggression in Viet Nam." After the New York City demonstration, the name of SMC was changed to National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, better known as Mobe. Dellinger remained a leader of Mobe.

In May 1967, Chairman Dellinger of Mobe assembled 700 delegates at a meeting in Washington, D.C., to plan a two-day demonstration in October – "Days of Confrontation" – with the focus of activity against the Pentagon. At the May meeting, Dellinger met with such important Communist Party functionaries as Arnold Johnson, Archie Brown, James Jackson, and Bettina Aptheker. Among Mobe's officials were some of the nation's most accomplished revolutionaries, including Ralph Abernathy, Sidney Lens, Sidney Peck, Dagmar Wilson, Jerry Rubin, and James Bevel.

Dellinger announced that the demonstration would be "peaceful" – "nonviolent civil disobedience" – and that "we'd like to block the entrances to the Pentagon in an attempt to disrupt the business there." From all over the nation, radicals of all ages poured into Washington. Estimates ran as high as 35,000. The "peaceful" Dellingerites listened to speeches by Benjamin Spock, Norman Mailer, Robert Lowell, Dwight MacDonald, and other radicals. Federal marshals, military police, and other troops were on hand to quell the demonstration in the event of violence. And violence came.

Dellinger's mob marched upon the Pentagon carrying Viet Cong flags. Troops on the scene were assaulted by

Dellinger's "peaceniks," who carried clubs, ax handles, rocks, bottles, and beer cans. Before the confrontation was over 667 arrests were made. Dellinger tried to conduct a "teach-in" for the soldiers. He was arrested. (Shortly before Dellinger led the anti-Pentagon demonstration, he traveled to Bratislava, Czecho-Slovakia, as a leader of a delegation of about forty other Americans who met with the same number of North Vietnamese and Viet Cong leaders.)

In May 1968, Dellinger and his Mobe began a new project – Summer of Support. Under the leadership of Rennie Davis, coffeehouses were established near military installations throughout the United States, to attract military personnel and to serve as alternatives to the "militaristic, drab, occasionally violent Army town environment." The Summer of Support veiled its real purpose of stirring up pacifist agitation among servicemen by describing its program as designed to support the servicemen and their right (?) to come home from Vietnam. Sponsors of Summer of Support include James Bevel, actor Marlon Brando, and Rev. William Sloane Coffin Jr., the Yale University chaplain who has agitated against the Vietnam War and the draft system since 1965.

While Summer of Support was busy establishing its coffeehouses, Dellinger was planning demonstrations to disrupt the Democratic National Convention, scheduled for August 1968. Mobe was the dominant coordinating force of groups that included Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panther Party, the Communist Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Youth International Party (Yippies).

In his summary of the Chicago demonstrations, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said: "Demonstrations held during the convention period included taunting of the police: they were referred to as 'pigs,' they were spat upon, obscenities were shouted at them and they were the targets of all kinds of unbelievable abuse; on several occasions undisciplined mobs intent on marching to the convention site without legal authority had to be repulsed by the police and National Guard. Reportedly many of the hippies used drugs regularly.

"The demonstrations resulted in mass arrests. Also, there were numerous police and demonstrators injured. Approximately 650 arrests were made by local authorities and nearly 200 police officers were injured during the confrontations with the demonstrators. It has been estimated that more than 900 persons obtained emergency treatment for injuries received during the disorder." (Dellinger had promised, "We will make our presence dramatically and militantly felt.")

On December 4 and 5, 1968, Dellinger testified before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. "My position has always been to avoid violence and to avoid provocation," he said, as he described himself as "a nonviolent revolutionist." What occurred at Chicago, Dellinger insisted, was neither his fault nor that of his followers but rather a result of "organized police violence [that] was part of a plan."

On March 20, 1969, Dellinger and seven of his cohorts were indicted by a federal grand jury at Chicago. Among the counts charged against Dellinger was "that during the period beginning on or about July 20, 1968 through on or about August 22, 1968, David T. Dellinger . . . did travel in interstate commerce from outside the State of Illinois to Chicago, Illinois . . . with intent to incite, organize, promote and encourage a riot and, thereafter, on or about August 28, 1968, at Grant Park, Chicago, Illinois, he did speak to an assemblage of persons for the purpose of inciting, organizing, promoting and encouraging a riot."

Dellinger and his co-defendants decided to call themselves "The Conspiracy," and invited others "to join a conspiracy of people against the forces that brought us Vietnam, the ABM, racism, high taxes, unemployment, hunger, political machines and a corporate system that exalts private profit and property over human needs." (A "Committee to Defend the Conspiracy" was immediately formed to solicit political and financial support for Dellinger and his co-defendants. Rallying for "The Conspiracy" were the usual letterhead performers, along with some newcomers: Leonard Bernstein, Julian Bond, Noam Chomsky, Congressmen John Conyers Jr. and Don Edwards, Judy Collins, Harvey Cox, Ossie Davis and his wife Ruby Dee, Jules Feiffer, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Sidney Lens, Helen Lynd, Dwight Macdonald, Norman Mailer, Stewart Meacham, Marcus Raskin, Pete Seeger, Tom Smothers, Albert Szent-Györgyi, Benjamin Spock, I.F. Stone, Harold Taylor, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn.)

The trial of "The Conspiracy" began on September 24, 1969, in the federal district court of Chicago. Early in the trial one of the prosecution's witnesses, Carl Gilman of San Diego, testified that in his capacity as a television reporter, he heard Dellinger call upon a crowd of collegians to "burn your draft cards, break the laws, disrupt the U.S. Government, and go to jail" to stop the war in Vietnam. And Dellinger concluded his remarks to the students by saying: "See you in Chicago." Before the trial was over, Dellinger would say that the "fascist court" was depriving him and his co-defendants of a fair trial. Similar and stronger remarks were directed at the prosecution and presiding judge by "The Conspiracy" throughout the tumultuous trial.

In the period between the riotous Chicago convention and the opening of "The Conspiracy's" trial, Dellinger was not idle. On September 14, 1968, he was chairman of a Mobe meeting in Washington, D.C. At the meeting, there were representatives of the Socialist Workers Party, the Communist Party, Resistance, *The Guardian,* the American Friends Service Committee, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Fellowship of Reconciliation, and the Young Socialist Alliance. The seventy-odd delegates made plans to disrupt the presidential campaign by various sorts of demonstrations. Then Dellinger and Mobe called for action during the presidential inaugural.

Testimony on the action that occurred was given before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations by J. Edgar Hoover, on April 17, 1969, as follows: "The demonstration activity at Washington, D.C., over the inaugural weekend began on January 18, 1969, with 600 to 1,000 individuals participating in workshops and conferences which were described as completely disorganized and chaotic. Among other activities on January 19 were a march by approximately 4,000 individuals and demonstrations including one at the Smithsonian Institute where a reception was held for Vice President Agnew and his wife. Some of the demonstrators threw clods of dirt and other items and, as a result, it was necessary for police to break up the demonstration. During the meetings on January 19, 1969, several of the demonstrators called for a confrontation with the police on January 20, 1969. The counterinaugural ball, which was held by the demonstrators on the evening of January 19, 1969, was poorly attended and disorganized.

"On January 20, 1969, 600 to 800 of the demonstrators positioned themselves along the inaugural parade route, particularly from 12th to 15th Street on Pennsylvania Avenue. They attempted to disrupt the parade by throwing objects, including a few smoke bombs, but were unsuccessful in their attempts. However, their actions made it necessary for police to disperse them.

"During the 3 days of demonstrations, 119 individuals were arrested, the majority on charges of disorderly conduct. During the 3 days, six of those arrested were charged with mutilation, burning, or desecration of the U.S. flag. Of those arrested, 10 were juveniles."

On July 4 and 5, 1969, in Cleveland, Ohio, more than three hundred radicals met with Dellinger in an "anti-war conference." Leaders at the conference included Arnold Johnson of the Communist Party, Fred Halstead of the Socialist Workers Party, Stewart Meacham of the American Friends Service Committee, Irving Sarnoff, Sidney Lens, Reverend Richard Fernandez of Clergy and Laymen Concerned, and Barbara Bick and Cora Weiss of Women Strike for Peace.

Out of the Cleveland meeting came plans that eventually resulted in the Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations of October and November 1969 in Washington and elsewhere throughout the nation. And it was after the Cleveland meeting that Dellinger's Mobe became the New Mobe, "to effect the inclusion of a wider social base among GIs, high school students, labor, clergy and third world communities."

Three days after the Cleveland meeting and while under indictment, Dellinger flew to Paris at the invitation of North Vietnamese officials for the purpose of negotiating the release of three American prisoners of war. The circumstances were rather extraordinary. Dellinger, of course, was under indictment for violating the federal "anti-riot" legislation. Yet through the connivance of the Justice and State Departments, he was allowed to go on Ho chi Minh's propaganda mission. In Paris, Dellinger conferred with U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Hanoi's agents to secure the release of the three prisoners of war. The entire episode was a humiliating landmark in American diplomacy and an international triumph for the "humanitarian" regime of the barbarous Ho chi Minh. And Dellinger was a willing participant in the anti-American, pro-Communist episode.

The "Conspiracy Trial" ended on February 18, 1970, when the jury found Dellinger guilty of violating the anti-riot provision of the 1968 Civil Rights Act by crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. He was sentenced to five years' imprisonment, fined $5,000, and assessed for a share of the costs of prosecution. The presiding judge also found Dellinger in contempt of court and sentenced him to two years, five months, and sixteen days in prison.

DONALD P. DENNIS was born on November 3, 1916 in Kenton, Ohio, son of Ella Snodgrass and Ray Dennis. He married Helen Hogue. He is an alumnus of Wittenberg College (B.A., 1939) and the University of Mississippi (M.A., 1942).

Since 1946, Dennis has been a close

working associate of Clarence Streit in the latter's Federal Union, *Freedom and Union* magazine, Atlantic Union Committee, and International Movement for Atlantic Union. Streit's globalist complex, in the beginning, worked for the incorporation of the United States and European "democracies" into the British Empire, as the basis for a world government. When the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed, the Federal Union program called for a political union of the NATO nations into an Atlantic Union. The program was later revised to promote a world government that would include Communist nations. Streit, Dennis, and their associates use a mixture of pacifism, scare-mongering, patriotism, political scientism, and virulent anti-nationalism to promote their program, which has attracted the support of an impressive roster of internationalists, not only from the United States but from all the NATO nations. Their supporters include academicians, businessmen, religious leaders, government officials, scientists, jurists, military leaders, artists, labor leaders, journalists, and theatrical personalities.

Dennis has held a variety of positions in Streit's operation: business manager of *Freedom and Union*; associate executive director, acting director, and national governor of the Atlantic Union Committee; member of the advisory council of the International Movement for Atlantic Union; and secretary, director, and executive director of Federal Union. Since 1953, he has also held various official positions with the Foreign Policy Association (a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda).

F. JOSEPH DONOHUE was born on January 15, 1900 in Lynn, Massachusetts, son of Gertrude Powers and James Donohue. He married Martha Apperson. He is an alumnus of Catholic University (A.B., 1922; LL.B., 1925).

Since 1925, Donohue has had a private law practice in Washington, D.C. From 1922 until 1930, he was an instructor in economics and banking at Catholic University and the American Banking Institute. From 1936 until 1940, he was a professor of law at Columbus University in Washington. In 1951, he was a member of the D.C. Board of Commissioners, and in 1952 and 1953, president of the Board. In 1952, he was chairman of the D.C. delegation to the Democratic National Convention. In 1956, he was vice chairman of the Stevenson-Kefauver presidential Campaign Committee. He is a member of the D.C. Democratic Central Committee.

Donohue has long been an activist in Clarence Streit's leftist-globalist complex: a member of the Atlantic Union Committee; a member of the International Movement for Atlantic Union; and a board member and treasurer of Clarence Streit's Federal Union.

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS was born on November 25, 1900 in Boonton, New Jersey, daughter of Lillian Mussen and Walter Gahagan. She married Melvyn Douglas. She attended Barnard College for two years. She is the author of *The Eleanor Roosevelt We Remember* (1963).

From 1922 until 1937, Mrs. Douglas was an actress (stage and films) and singer (concert and opera).

The late Eleanor Roosevelt, in collaboration with Lorena Hickok, provided a fascinating account of how Mrs. Douglas interrupted her entertainment career to become interested in politics. "Her conversion was as dramatic as a first-act curtain in the theater." (See *Ladies of Courage*, 1954.)

It seems that in 1937, Mrs. Douglas was in a Viennese coffee house with three friends and a stranger. The topic of their conversation was music "until suddenly the stranger leaned across the table, stared at her arrogantly, and said: 'Of course, Miss Gahagan, you are pure Aryan?' " For Mrs. Douglas, "the impact was swift and violent. This man was a Nazi!" And Mrs. Douglas "came home dedicated to an idea. The evil thing that Hitler stood for must be destroyed, wherever, whenever, in whatever form it appeared. She was on the road to becoming a politician."

Along the way toward politics, however, Mrs. Douglas encountered a two-year detour. She and her husband belatedly discovered the plight of the "Okies" – farmers and laborers who had migrated from the Midwest and Southwest seeking agricultural work in California. The Douglases became active in organizing relief for the Okies but somehow realized that Communists had infiltrated their organization. "The Douglases got out, and Helen talked about it for months to everyone she met. But nobody paid much attention to her, for most Americans who were not isolationists were more worried about the Nazi Fifth Column those days than they were about Communist infiltration." If the experience with Okie relief did nothing else, it established the myth of Helen Gahagan Douglas' anti-Communism.

By 1939, Mrs. Douglas had become an active New Dealer. In that year, she was on the national advisory committee of the Works Progress Administration and California's advisory committee of the National Youth Authority. In 1940, she was an alternate delegate to the Democrat National Convention and, in that same year, she was elected as Democrat National Committee Woman of California and made 168 speeches across the country on behalf of President Roosevelt's third-term candidacy. From 1941 until 1944, she was vice chairman of California's Democrat Central Committee.

In 1944, Mrs. Douglas was elected from California's 14th District to the House of Representatives in the Seventy-ninth Congress. In her campaign she was supported by Sidney Hillman's Political Action Committee, which had the total support of the Communist Party. In that same year, Mrs. Douglas actively campaigned against Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada, unquestionably the most vigorous anti-Communist Democrat in the Senate then and until his death in 1954. (Mrs. Douglas' election made her a national celebrity of sorts. The New York Hadassah named her Woman of the Year. The National Council of Negro Women selected her as one of the twelve outstanding women of the year, and Mrs. Douglas became a life member of the organization.)

Mrs. Douglas was twice re-elected to Congress. In her 1948 campaign, she was supported by the Progressive Citizens of America ("a Communist front") and the Independent Progressive Party ("one of the largest and most successful fronts ever created by the Communists"). During her six years in Congress, Mrs. Douglas voted consistently with the far left wing of the New Deal and Fair Deal Democrats. So recognizable was her leftism that the Communists' *Daily Worker* hailed her as one of the "heroes [*sic*] of the Eightieth Congress."

In 1950, Mrs. Douglas became a candidate for the United States Senate. Sheridan Downey, the incumbent and a

Democrat, was retiring from political life because of ill health. He was somewhat less than enthusiastic over Mrs. Douglas' qualifications to be his successor. Said Downey: "She has shown no inclination, in fact no ability, to dig in and do the hard and tedious work required to prepare legislation and push it through Congress. Mrs. Douglas gave comfort to the Soviet tyranny by voting against aid to both Greece and Turkey. She voted against the President [Truman] in a crisis when he most needed her support and most fully deserved her confidence. She was one of a small but determined band which fought to the bitter end to keep Henry A. Wallace on the Democratic ticket at the 1944 Democratic convention and . . . she wept in total collapse when Harry Truman was finally nominated over Wallace." Mrs. Douglas, however, won the Democrat Party's nomination over four other candidates. In the election, her Republican opponent was Richard M. Nixon.

The Nixon-Douglas campaign was from the outset one of the hardest fought in California's stormy political history. On behalf of Mrs. Douglas, there came to California Vice President Alben Barkley, Attorney General J. Howard McGrath, Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan, and the ubiquitous duo of Averell Harriman and Eleanor Roosevelt. (Early in the campaign, Republican Governor Earl Warren let it be known that neither he nor his political organization would support Nixon, which in theory if not in effect was a boost for Mrs. Douglas.)

Nixon and his aides made no secret of the fact that they were campaigning against "the pink lady." Said Nixon: "My opponent did not vote as a Democrat. She did not vote as a Republican . . . . It just so happens that my opponent is a member of a small clique which joins the notorious party-liner, Vito Marcantonio of New York, in voting time after time against measures that are for the security of this country." For her part, Mrs. Douglas castigated "such pipsqueaks as Nixon and [U.S. Senator Joseph R.] McCarthy who are trying to get us so frightened of Communism that we'll be afraid to turn out the lights." She also turned her wrath upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities (of which Nixon was a member), saying that "the committee had become a court, with the power to smear innocent names across the nation's headlines, without even enough charity to invite its victims to appear before it in self-defense . . . . I do not believe in trial by headline. Congress is subject to all kinds of political pressures. I do not believe we can make a committee of Congress into a court and maintain justice."

On the Nixon side, some of the most vigorous supporters were "Democrats for Nixon." Ruth Turner of this group, a former president of the San Francisco League of Women Voters, charged Mrs. Douglas with pro-Communist sympathies: "You, and you can't deny it, have earned the praise of Communist and pro-Communist newspapers for opposing the very things Nixon has stood for. And you have done this, as I and so many of my Democratic friends are well aware, against the judgment and the votes of the majority of Democrats in the Congress."

Ralph de Toledano in his *Nixon*, published in 1956, observed: "The most pointed job done by Democrats for Nixon was to prepare a list of the Communist-front affiliations of Mrs. Douglas: ' . . . speaker before the International Workers Order, cited by two

Democratic U.S. Attorney Generals as "Communist and subversive," . . . sponsor of the Win the Peace Conference . . . cited as "Communist and subversive" by a Democratic U.S. Attorney General , . . . On October 17, 1947, . . . speaker at a dinner meeting of the Civil Rights Congress, cited as "Communist and subversive" by the Democratic Attorney General, . . . speaker at a political meeting . . . sponsored by the California Labor School, cited as "subversive and Communist" by a Democratic U.S. Attorney General . . . . ' " Mrs. Douglas' affiliations both before and since the 1950 campaign have also included: the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief ("subversive and Communist"); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the League of Women Shoppers ("Communist-controlled front"); the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; and the leftwing Freedom House.

Nixon, who was characterized by Mrs. Douglas as a "reactionary," pounded away "at the fact that Mrs. Douglas had voted against Greek-Turkish aid; against Selective Service in 1948; with pro-Communist representative Vito Marcantonio on 354 occasions (often in opposition to the Democratic majority in the House); against appropriations for the House Un-American Activities Committee; against measures to weed Communists out of the Atomic Energy Commission, the State Department, and other sensitive agencies; against citing recalcitrant Communists for contempt of Congress.

"Douglas campaign literature had listed among her achievements that she 'exposed Communist propaganda in her famous speech, *My Democratic Credo.*' Nixon quoted from that speech. Its opening sentence was: 'I think we all know that communism is no real threat to the democratic institutions of this country.' Nixon pointed out that Mrs. Douglas had called for the United States to share its atomic secrets with the Soviet Union, by turning them over to the United Nations, long before the Russians had stolen them and developed A-bombs of their own. She had voted against a bill barring foreign relief to Soviet-dominated countries unless it was supervised by Americans who would see to it that such relief was not used for Communist political purposes." (de Toledano, *Nixon,* page 95.)

When the 1950 election returns were complete, Nixon – with 682,000 votes more than Mrs. Douglas – had achieved the highest plurality of any senatorial candidate in that year. For Mrs. Douglas, it was the end of her office-holding career. She returned to the entertainment field and, between 1952 and 1962, she made a few stage appearances as an actress, performed in concerts, and gave poetry readings. In recent years, she has traveled around the world "to study the problems of developing nations and to proselytize for 'total – not unilateral – disarmament.' " (See "Where Are They Now?," *Newsweek,* March 28, 1966.) Mrs. Douglas maintains that she became a pacifist after Hiroshima. In 1969 and other years, she has solicited funds for the ultra-leftwing pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, using the familiar leftwing, bleeding-heart line: "How can you reconcile our ability to send men to the moon with our inability to end the immoral war in Vietnam . . . the expenditures of billions on nuclear arms and ABM systems with the failure to rebuild the ghettos . . . the concept of a United States, 'One Nation Indivisible,' with the tragedy of a country composed of two societies – one black, one white – separate and unequal."

LEWIS W. DOUGLAS was born on July 2, 1894 in Bisbee, Arizona, son of Josephine Williams and James Douglas. He married Peggy Zinsser. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (B.A., 1916). In 1916 and 1917, he studied metallurgy and geology at Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Since 1921, Douglas has had an active business career, holding offices and directorships in such organizations as American Cyanamid Company, Mutual Life Insurance of New York, Douglas Investment Company, Western Bancorp, International Nickel, General Motors, Newmont Mining Corporation, and Union Corporation. In public service, he was a member of Arizona's House of Representatives (1923-1925), a member of the U.S. House of Representatives (1927-1933), the U.S. Director of the Budget (1933-1934), deputy administrator of the War Shipping Administration (1942-1944), and U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain (1947-1950).

Douglas has been a member and officer of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. In 1954, he was affiliated with the ultra-leftwing National Committee for an Effective Congress when that organization urged all U.S. Senators to support measures that would stifle all congressional investigations of Communism. He was chairman and president of American Assembly, a satellite of the Council on Foreign Relations. (The American Assembly has had a long record of endorsing ultra-liberal and ultra-leftist programs for the domestic and foreign policies of the United States government.) He has been an officer of the International Movement for Atlantic Union, the Atlantic Council of the United States, and the Atlantic Union Committee – all parts of Clarence Streit's Federal Union complex, organized to promote one-world government.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS was born on March 26, 1892 in Salem, Massachusetts, son of Annie Smith and James Douglas. He was married to and divorced from Dorothy Wolff. His second wife is Emily Taft. He is an alumnus of Bowdoin College (A.B., 1913) and Columbia University (A.M., 1915; Ph.D., 1921). He also pursued graduate studies in 1915 and 1916 at Harvard University. He is the author of *American Apprenticeship and Industrial Education* (1921); *Wages and the Family* (1925); *Real Wages in the United States, 1890-1926* (1930); *The Coming of a New Party* (1932); *Standards of Unemployment Insurance* (1933); *The Theory of Wages* (1934); *Controlling Depressions* (1935); *Social Security in the United States* (1936); *Ethics in Government* (1952); *Economy in the National Government* (1952); *America in the Market Place* (1966); and *In Our Time* (1968).

In 1916 and 1917, Douglas was an economics instructor at the University of Illinois. In 1917 and 1918, he was an assistant professor of economics at Reed College. In 1918 and 1919, he was engaged in industrial relations work. In 1919 and 1920, he was an associate professor of economics at the University of Washington. From 1920 until 1948, he was in the economics department at the University of Chicago: as assistant professor of industrial relations (1920-1923); associate professor

(1923-1925); and professor (1925-1948). From 1924 until 1927, he was a visiting professor at Amherst College. From 1933 until 1935, he was on the consumers' advisory board of the New Deal's National Recovery Administration. From 1937 until 1939, he was an advisor to the New Deal's Social Security Board.

During his years at the University of Chicago, Douglas was one of the country's most active radicals. He was a close working associate of many of the nation's leading Communists and was a very important figure in the Socialist Party and various Socialist groups. He belonged to the League for Independent Political Action, which included in its objectives diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States, complete disarmament for the United States, and repeal of all anti-sedition laws; to the ultra-radical American Civil Liberties Union; the socialist League for Industrial Democracy; and to the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia, one of the earliest Communist fronts in this country. He was affiliated with the Rand School, a Socialist training school for labor agitators. He was also affiliated with two of the largest radical-pacifist organizations: the American Friends Service Committee and the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

From 1939 until 1942, Douglas was an alderman in the Chicago City Council. In 1942, he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Democratic nomination for the U.S. Senate. Also in 1942, Douglas – at the age of fifty – enlisted in the U.S.Marine Corps and had a distinguished combat career in the Pacific Theatre. In 1947, Douglas was one of the founding members of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action.

In 1948, Douglas was elected to the Senate from Illinois, on the Democratic ticket. He was given financial help in 1948 and again in 1954 by the very powerful ultra-leftwing pressure group, the National Committee for an Effective Congress. From 1949 until 1967, while Douglas was in the U.S. Senate, he was in the forefront of the liberals. Near the end of his senatorial career, Douglas received an accolade from one of the arch-priests of the Liberal Establishment, Hubert H. Humphrey, who noted: "There is no member of the Senate today who has his name stamped on more major issues, major bills and major legislation than Paul Douglas." Douglas' efforts did not go unrewarded. As a Senator, he received two of the most coveted leftwing recognitions: the Sidney Hillman Award and the annual Freedom House Award.

When Douglas was unsuccessful in his bid for re-election to the Senate in 1966, he was not deserted by the Left. He was appointed to the graduate faculty at the ultra-radical New School for Social Research. In 1967, he was installed as chairman of the board of trustees of Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism with a membership composed of a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent.

DOUGLAS DOWD was born on December 7, 1919 in San Francisco. He is an alumnus of the University of California (A.B., circa 1941; Ph.D., 1951).

From 1950 until 1953, Dowd was a lecturer in economics and business administration at the University of California. Since 1953, he has been in the economics department at Cornell University, as assistant professor (1953-circa 1960), associate professor (circa 1960-

circa 1967), and currently as a professor.

In 1961, Dowd petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to Frank Wilkinson, head of the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"), who had been convicted for contempt of Congress. Dowd signed several petitions to abolish the HCUA. He has spoken under the auspices of the leftwing-pacifist American Friends Service Committee. He has been deeply involved with racial agitators, and on one occasion he spoke on "Socialism and Civil Rights" at a meeting held by the W.E.B. DuBois Club (Communist-dominated) on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. He has also been active in leftwing-peacenik groups protesting U.S. participation in the Vietnam War, and he has been affiliated with David Dellinger's leftwing National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

WALTER DOWLING was born on August 4, 1905 in Atkinson, Georgia, son of Alice Benton and Walter Dowling. He married Alice Jernigan. He is an alumnus of Mercer University (A.B., 1925).

From 1925 until 1931, Dowling was in the banking business. In 1931, he was appointed a foreign service officer in the Department of State, where he was to serve for thirty-two years. From 1931 until 1950, he held minor posts in Oslo, Lisbon, Rome, Rio de Janeiro, Vienna, and Washington, D.C. From 1950 until 1953, he was U.S. deputy high commissioner for Austria. In 1953 and 1954, he was the U.S. deputy high commissioner for Germany. In 1955 and 1956, he was minister at the U.S. Embassy in Bonn. From 1956 until 1959, he was the U.S. Ambassador to South Korea. In 1959, he was assistant secretary of state for European affairs. From 1959 until 1963, he was the U.S. Ambassador to West Germany.

Since 1965, Dowling has been director-general of the Atlantic Institute, located in Paris. (The first director-general of the Atlantic Institute, which was founded in 1961, was Henry Cabot Lodge. The Institute is a major one-world agency of the Liberal Establishment. Dowling has explained that the Institute is designed to promote discussion of common economic, political, and social problems of the NATO nations not "by experts but by public-spirited citizens." The fact remains, however, that participants in the Institute's programs are generally very close to the circles of policy-making power in their respective nations. Proceedings of the Institute are not made public, but its officials admit that they are working for a unity of the NATO nations that would not preclude very close political and economic ties. The Institute receives considerable support from the socialist-internationalist-oriented Ford Foundation.)

Dowling is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

CHARLES DREKMEIER was born on September 10, 1927 in Beloit, Wisconsin, son of Marion Griswold and Albert Drekmeier. He married Margot Loungway. He is an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1948); Columbia University (A.M., 1950); and Harvard University (Ph.D., 1959). In 1953 and 1954, he was a Fulbright scholar in India. In 1960 and 1961, he was a Carnegie fellow at Harvard University's Law School. He is author of *Kingship and Community in Early India* (1962).

From 1951 until 1956, Drekmeier was at Boston University as instructor (1951-1953) and assistant professor (1954-1956). Since 1958, he has been at Stanford University as assistant professor (1958-1964) and, since 1964, associate professor of political science.

Drekmeier has been very prominent in leftwing activities in California. In 1960, he petitioned California's Attorney General to investigate "police brutality" alleged to have been used against the militants in the Communist-led anti-House Committee on Un-American Activities riots in San Francisco. In 1962, he sponsored an anti-anti-Communist seminar in San Francisco ("The Impact of the Radical Right"). In 1963, he supported racial agitators by speaking on their behalf before a joint meeting on the Stanford campus of the Socialist, Peace, and Civil Liberties Caucuses. In 1963, he opposed the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's investigation of the Pacifica Foundation's radio stations, which have been important forums for Communists, Communist fronters, and black revolutionaries. He supported the Free [Filthy] Speech movement on the Berkeley campus of the University of California. On the Stanford campus, he has been a leader of the leftwing-peacenik groups in opposition to U.S. participation in the Vietnam War.

BENJAMIN B. DREYFUS was born in 1910 in San Francisco. He is an alumnus of Stanford University (LL.B., circa 1938).

On February 3, 1965, U.S. Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.), chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, recited Dreyfus' record on the floor of the Senate: "He was identified on June 19, 1957, by Dr. Jack Beverly Patten, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, as a former member of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Patten testified under oath, and identified Dreyfus as a fellow member of the professional section of the Communist Party in San Francisco in the early 1940's.

"Dreyfus himself testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on June 21, 1956, and invoked the first and fifth amendments of the Constitution in refusing to answer questions regarding Communist Party membership. He admitted membership in the National Lawyers Guild and the holding of official posts in that organization.

"Dreyfus is a former president of the National Lawyers Guild ["the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"]. He was elected a member of the National Executive Board of the National Lawyers Guild at its 1956 convention.

"Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of the California Statewide Legislative Conference held in February of 1947 in Sacramento. This conference was cited as subversive in the 1947 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at pages 240-242. Benjamin Dreyfus turned up the next year as a member of the expanded executive board of the California Legislative Conference, according to a report in the *Daily People's World* of September 13, 1948. The California Legislative Conference was cited as subversive by the fifth report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities for 1949, at pages 436 and 437.

"The *Daily People's World* of October 24, 1949, in an article captioned

'Five Thousand Dollars for Defense Fight Against Medina Edict Started at CRC Dinner,' reported that Benjamin Dreyfus, referred to as secretary of the National Lawyers Guild, had been toastmaster at a testimonial banquet sponsored by the Civil Rights Congress ["subversive and Communist"] and held at 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco.

"According to a news story in the *Santa Rosa Press Democrat* of October 30, 1950, Benjamin Dreyfus spoke on October 29, 1950, at a meeting sponsored by the California Legislative Conference, and held at the Labor Temple at Santa Rosa. This is the same California Legislative Conference that I mentioned earlier as having been cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities.

"The 1955 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 329, listed Benjamin Dreyfus as a speaker on October 5, 1953, at a meeting of the Los Angeles Committee To Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs ["Communist front"], convicted atom spies.

"Benjamin Dreyfus was counsel for William Schneiderman, identified Communist leader, in 1956, according to a report appearing in the *Daily Worker* of September 11, 1956, at page 3.

"Benjamin Dreyfus, listed as 'president of the National Lawyers Guild in Los Angeles,' was scheduled to speak on November 11, 1960 at a meeting of the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms at St. Nicholas Greek Church in Los Angeles. The Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms was cited as subversive by the California Committee on Un-American Activities in its 1963 report, at page 13.

"In February 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus signed a petition for executive clemency for Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, whose appeal after conviction had been denied by the U.S. Supreme Court. In June of 1961, Benjamin Dreyfus was a sponsor of an East Bay community forum in honor of Bertram Edises, an identified Communist.

"The 1961 report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, at page 117, lists Benjamin Dreyfus as a member of the Southern California Executive Committee of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee has been cited as subversive by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

"Benjamin Dreyfus has signed several petitions for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. One instance of this was reported in a circular accompanying a letter dated March 27, 1963 and signed by Clarence E. Pickett, appealing for support for a campaign to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Another more recent instance, was reported in the *Worker* of December 8, 1964."

Dreyfus has been affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign") and the leftwing racial agitators of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. He has supported the Spring Mobilization Committee, a major leftwing group against the Vietnam War. He has defended racial agitators. His law partner is Charles Garry, counsel for the Black Panthers.

Dreyfus has been identified under oath as a Communist, but in 1957, when asked about his membership and activities within the Communist Party, he pleaded the protection of the Fifth Amendment.

ROBERT F. DRINAN was born on November 15, 1920 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Anne Flanagan and James Drinan. He is an alumnus of Boston College (A.B., 1942; M.A., 1947); Georgetown University (LL.B., 1949; LL.M., 1950); and Gregorian University (S.T.L., 1954). He entered the Society of Jesus in 1942, and in 1953 was ordained to the priesthood. In 1954 and 1955, he pursued graduate studies in Florence, Italy.

Drinan was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia in 1950, to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1955, and to the Massachusetts bar in 1956. In 1955 and 1956, he was assistant dean of Boston College's Law School. Since 1957, he has been dean of the law school, and in 1969, he was appointed provost and vice president of Boston College. In 1966 and 1967, he was a visiting professor at the University of Texas Law School.

Drinan is the author of *Religion, The Courts, and Public Policy*. He is a corresponding editor of the weekly *America*, produced by a group of Jesuits, which has an editorial policy that would be appropriate to a publication of Americans for Democratic Action or any other Socialist-oriented magazine. He has contributed numerous articles and book reviews to various journals and newspapers. He has appeared frequently before Congressional committees and as a panelist on radio and television programs.

In his off-campus activities, Drinan has marched under the banner of ultraliberalism. He has full command of liberalism's clichés. He is an effective annihilator of strawmen of his own creation. He attacks with non sequiturs, exaggeration, innuendo, anonymous sources, dogmatism, and a do-gooder's righteous indignation. If a public issue has both a left and a right side, he invariably is on the former.

The Warren Court had no more enthusiastic cheerleader than Drinan. As one decision after another corrupted due process into undue permissiveness, he rejoiced that "the Supreme Court, without treasury or army, exercises by its moral prestige a political power not possessed by any other tribunal in the world." Somewhere, somehow, in 1965, he found a growing public consensus in support of the Supreme Court's "liberal" positions. His placing of quotation marks around liberal could only indicate that he believed the term either too weak or too strong a description. There is evidence, however, that Drinan believed that the Court was not quite liberal enough. After one of his mysterious surveys, he found "one of the most persistent feelings which Americans have towards the United States Supreme Court is the conviction that this tribunal will – after all other methods have failed – eventually rectify injustices and depose tyrants." And, evidently in the same survey, he found that the nation desired the Supreme Court "to intervene in the great public policy issues of the day." When and how the "nation" was canvassed and found willing to condone assumption of totalitarian power by a tribunal of nine men went unmentioned by Drinan, but he left no doubt that he favored the results of the canvass.

Drinan's reverential regard for the Warren Court was very much in evidence when he was the featured speaker at the annual convention banquet of the National Lawyers Guild in November 1965. (In 1950, the House Committee on Un-American Activities described the National Lawyers Guild as "the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party."

In 1953, the Attorney General of the United States called the NLG "the legal mouthpiece of the Communist Party." In 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee found the NLG to be "a bulwark of protection when the Communist Party itself is under fire." In 1961, the latest edition of the HCUA's *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications* still included the NLG in its list of subversive organizations, even though the Attorney General in the Eisenhower Administration, William P. Rogers, had rescinded the designation, "subversive," because witnesses and evidence were lacking at that time to continue the designation. Yet, in 1965, when Abe Fortas was testifying on his own behalf for an appointment to the Supreme Court, he disavowed his earlier involvement with the NLG.)

In his address to the National Lawyers Guild, Drinan complained that lawyers had not been diligent enough in maintaining public confidence in the courts and compliance with their decisions. With specific reference to the Supreme Court, he said: "If the bar in America today were truly independent it would condemn those blatant assaults on the judiciary which in recent years have attained a new level of effrontery and arrogance. Would a truly independent bar, a bar that was profoundly devoted to the rule of law, fail to protest vigorously and effectively the defamatory demands for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States? . . . . Does constitutionally protected freedom of speech or freedom of the press give immunity for slander and public defamation of the nation's highest tribunal? And by what principle can an independent bar justify its inaction towards those who, by calumny and libel, impugn the motives of judges and undermine the very essence of every civilized society – the rule of law?"

By Drinan's standards, only some lawyers and some laymen, in their criticism of Supreme Court personnel and Supreme Court decisions, would be guilty of "blatant assaults" – "effrontery and arrogance" – "defamatory demands" – "slander and public defamation" – "calumny and libel." Other lawyers, however, who realize their mission – "the mission of the lawyer as the moral architect of society" – should "feel free to criticize judicial decisions consistently and courageously. This criticism should not be confined to the higher courts but should be applicable to every tribunal whose opinions are deficient in inherent logic and clear consistency."

In the context of his address to the National Lawyers Guild, Drinan advocated an elitist control of the law by the members of the Liberal Establishment, the moral architects of society who were not contaminated by "the conservative, upper middle class, almost reactionary socio-economic attitudes which law students frequently bring with them into the study of law."

There were not many Liberal Establishment bases untouched by Drinan in his meandering remarks to the National Lawyers Guild. The depression of the thirties, he explained, "resulted from a legally unplanned and unregulated economy." (No Socialist, and for that matter no Marxist, could quarrel with the alternative – a legally planned and regulated economy.) The National Lawyers Guild had "to struggle against all the tyrannies of the national hysteria which obsessed America in the 1950's." The National Lawyers Guild "lent its power and prestige" against "the basic injustice of permitting false accusations to be made by public bodies in the name of patriotism or loyalty to the nation," and "to a degree unappreciated by many the Guild has steadfastly opposed loyalty oaths, public character assassination, racism in all its many forms and every other tyranny over the mind of man." (Compare Drinan's tributes to the NLG with the following findings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities: "Since its [the NLG's] inception it has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents. It has consistently fought against national, State, and local legislation aimed at curbing the Communist conspiracy. It has been most articulate in its attack upon all agencies of the Government seeking to expose or prosecute the subversive activities of the Communist network, including national, State, and local investigative committees, the Department of Justice, the FBI, and law enforcement agencies generally." On August 28, 1966, writing in the *Boston Globe,* Drinan made a vehement attack upon the House Committee on Un-American Activities and at the same time paid a fulsome tribute to the National Committee to Abolish HUAC and its Massachusetts group. When the NCAHUAC was organized, six years prior to Drinan's plug for it, at least seven of its founders were Communists. On April 24, 1968, Drinan joined with notorious leftwingers Benjamin Spock, John C. Bennett, Robert M. Hutchins, and Roger Baldwin in an hysterical attack upon the HCUA, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The three committees, respectively, were investigating the Communist-anarchistic Students for a Democratic Society, the Communist-dominated National Conference for New Politics, and the 1967 Negro riots. Drinan and his fellow bleeding-hearts charged that the three committees "threaten to repeat the experience of the nineteen-fifties when the cry of Communism by Senator [Joseph R.] McCarthy and his acolytes stifled [*sic*] all but the most orthodox politics" and may lead "as in the fifties, not only to silence [*sic*] but also to persecution [*sic*], prosecution [*sic*] and loss of jobs [*sic*].")

The National Lawyers Guild was also regaled by Drinan's globalism, expressed in the clichés that form such a rich part of the Liberals' vocabulary: " . . . The greatest injustice in the world today is . . . world-wide hunger and poverty, – a tragedy which results in poor nations afflicted by starvation dwelling as islands of poverty in a sea of affluence. If American lawyers truly believed in human equality would they not be compelled to work for an international tribunal or a world government capable of distributing the food and resources of mankind in an equitable way?" – "New social revolutions are ahead, – the most needed of which is probably a movement towards united world federalism [appropriately enough, Drinan has been a vice chairman of Boston's chapter of the leftwing-pacifist United World Federalists], – a world government with power to distribute the food, wealth and resources of the world in ways which will lessen and eventually eliminate the scandalous and inhuman mal-distribution of these items that now prevails." – " . . . The establishment of a world order where true equality for all men is really attainable." – "The profoundly emotional isolationism of so many Americans and the frighteningly widespread hostility to the United Nations are surely attitudes prominent in public opinion which an independent bar must continually seek to correct and change." – "It seems obvious that the extension of the rule of law to the world community of nations must take priority over almost any other task facing the bar in America. But the legal profession will be able to undertake this task only if it is independent of the dominance of that irrational, super-patriotic and nationalistic element in public opinion which, by urging a restriction of America's participation in the family of nations, in effect denies the central principle of our jurisprudence, – human equality."

It is only reasonable to interpret Drinan's remarks as a severe indictment of Americans as selfish isolationists, deliberately starving other peoples, and unwilling to allow a family of nations – including Communists and other totalitarians who disdain law and order, justice, equality, and other facets of humanitarianism – to serve as an omniscient and omni-beneficent international tribunal to redistribute food, wealth, and resources so as to achieve human equality, which has heretofore been denied by the irrational, super-patriotic and nationalistic element in America.

Drinan reverted to this globalistic theme in 1969, when he said: "Students are asking for a new set of moral values and ideals in American society. They see a nation that spends more than $1 billion a year on arms, that arms primitive [?] societies, and that is waging a war against so-called Communists [from so-called North Vietnam?] and want a new society that's not armed to the teeth. We have six per cent of the world's population and 73 per cent of the wealth." Therefore, Drinan suggested that five per cent of America's gross product be turned over to a world organization "to deal with problems of sickness and hunger. Unregulated capitalism [where he discovered that, he didn't say] is inconsistent with democratic principles and ideals. We have to think in global terms otherwise the rest of the world [including the Soviet Union, Red China, Red Cuba, and North Vietnam] will say that the white people of America [exclusively white?] are selfish and egocentric and don't think about the starving of the world."

The Negro problem was given some attention by Drinan when he spoke to the National Lawyers Guild. As a matter of fact, a portion of his remarks appears, in retrospect, to have been a precursor of James Forman's outrageous "Black Manifesto of 1969," which has plagued church and synagogue groups across the nation. Said Drinan: "Every segment of our society is proclaiming that it desires to extend to all Negroes every opportunity which white persons enjoy. This bland assertion, however, really means little because the real question is this: How can society give to the Negro some compensatory or preferential or retributive advantages so that he can overcome the disabilities of more than a century? The moment, however, that one raises this question massive public opinion reacts automatically and vehemently by self-righteously denouncing 'discrimination-in-reverse.' This inability even to explore the reasons why anti-discrimination laws and policies are not sufficent carries over into the legal profession where the fixation against alleged 'discrimination-in-reverse' is given a legal justification as if it were one of the sacred pillars of the Republic. The lawyer with independent judgment, however, will be able to see that American society has crippled the Negro and that as a result the socio-economic gap between the white person and the Negro is *not* narrowing but rather widening. Some method of restitution or reparation or indemnification for the Negro is therefore necessary before we can expect to witness substantial improvement in the economic conditions of the 'other America.' "

In May 1969, Black Panther leader James Forman demanded $500 million in reparations for the Negroes from the churches and synagogues of America. Similar claims for astronomical reparations have been made by the leaders of the Republic of New Africa, which aims to establish a black nation within the United States.

In 1964, in a speech to a legal conference conducted by the leftwing-racist Congress of Racial Equality, Drinan plunged into racial agitation. He urged Negroes to use children in civil rights demonstrations as long as there was no physical danger to the children and no question of prolonged absence from school. How it was possible to predict that a civil rights demonstration would be physically safe was not mentioned by Drinan.

In the same speech to the CORE group, Drinan urged Negroes to civil disobedience to laws they consider unjust: "In hundreds of grievances, there is no legal machinery to process the complaint, much less bring it to the state of 'the last resort.' " A year later, however, Drinan played a different tune: "Every good citizen should follow a law in its letter and its spirit until it is repealed."

In 1965, Drinan, who worries so much about a rule of law, apparently gave Negroes a dispensation so that they could coerce other Americans: "The concern of whites for the Negro race will fade away if Negro militancy declines. In fact, the progress of the nation's 21 million Negroes will continue to come about in direct proportion to the intensity and pervasiveness of Negro militancy." (Less than a month later, thousands of Negroes in an awesome display of militancy rioted for six days in Los Angeles – thirty-five persons were killed and an estimated $200 million was lost due to arson, looting, and wanton destruction. But Drinan could not be blamed since he had qualified his encouragement to the civil rightists by advising that the militancy be nonviolent.)

In his concern over the civil rights of Negroes, Drinan's "liberalism" apparently impels him toward near-advocacy of a police state. In 1965, writing on recommendations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, he said: "The recommendation that all major crimes, or at least homicides, committed in connection with controversies over civil rights be made Federal crimes has, of course, many ramifications. Such a proposal is an admitted invasion of local and state substantive law and public policy. The undeniable benefits which such a law would bring about must be weighed against the probable consequences of additional Southern ill-will towards Federal power and the creation of a precedent of Federal intervention into an area of criminal justice traditionally [constitutionally would be a more appropriate term for Lawyer Drinan to have used] reserved to the states.

"Relating to this recommendation is the promising suggestion made by Prof. Howard Zinn of Boston University [who, incidentally, has urged Negroes to take up arms "to scare the federal government into action"] that the Federal Government create a corps of Emancipation or 'E' men like the Treasury's 'T' men or the FBI's agents.

"These 'E' men would be present at all civil rights demonstrations, would have the power to make on the spot arrests and would constitute a very desirable [*sic*] Federal 'presence' in the South.

"A new body of 'E' men might well be able to achieve things in the South which the FBI is either unable or unwilling [?] to accomplish."

It is only reasonable to assume that, by Drinan's standards, "an admitted invasion of local and state substantive law and public policy" is justifiable by a "promising suggestion" of a federal police force, created despite constitutional prohibitions in the Tenth Amendment. (As for Drinan's gratuitous insult to the FBI, he maintains the liberal's typical reticence, offering no details as to what the FBI is "unwilling to accomplish.")

Reticence is not Drinan's only weapon. There are times when he is spectacularly vituperative. One such occasion was when he testified before the Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee in 1966. The matter of the moment was a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States by which voluntary prayer would be permitted in public schools. The amendment was sponsored by the late Everett Dirksen of Illinois and many of his senatorial colleagues. Drinan testified against the amendment, having been "requested and strongly urged" to do so by "Catholic, Protestant and Jewish individuals and organizations."

The amendment, according to Drinan, was "incomprehensible" – "baffling" – "self-contradictory" – "an almost irrational refusal to surrender one of the most persistent myths in American life – the illusion that the public school can train future citizens in morality and piety" – "an emotional response" to Supreme Court decisions banning compulsory prayer and Bible-reading in public schools. As for the Senators who supported the amendment, they displayed a "truly pathetic desire to be identified with the popular mind." "For what reason," Drinan asked, "do 40 Senators seek to appear more pious than the Churches and more righteous than the Supreme Court?" (Unfortunately no Senator quarreled with Drinan's identification of the repositories of piety and righteousness. From his elitist point of view the "Churches" and the "Supreme Court" could not be wrong.)

Drinan's concern for public schools has not been confined to the voluntary prayer controversy. He is firmly opposed to elective school committees: "The days of the elective school committee are over. There is no reason why an elective school committee should run so delicate an operation as a school system." He has admitted that he does not know what alternative there might be except the examples of New York City and Chicago where school committees are appointed by elective politicians who make their choices from "outstanding" citizens. Why elected politicians should be better qualified than the electorate to choose outstanding citizens went unexplained.

The racial composition of public schools has also been a matter of serious concern to Drinan, especially in his capacity as chairman of the Massachusetts State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Under Drinan's leadership the Massachusetts group excoriated what it alleged was de facto racial segregation in Boston schools as harmful to children. At the same time, the neighborhood school system came under fire from Drinan and his colleagues. They were somewhat mollified, however, when the Massachusetts legislature passed a "racial imbalance" law for public schools. Said Drinan: "The consensus was that we needed the law because this is the only way to correct the situation in Boston. To say 50 or 64 per cent of the population does not want it is a mathematical thing. Racial imbalance must be alleviated." (Why "50 or 64 per cent" would not qualify as a consensus went unexplained. But again it would appear that if the elite agree, then Drinan readily accepts that small minority's opinion as a consensus.)

The Vietnam War has come under Drinan's fire. In 1969, he traveled to Vietnam with the so-called U.S. Study Team on Religious and Political Freedom in Vietnam. His companions included John de J. Pemberton, the executive director of the leftist American Civil Liberties Union; Mrs. John C. Bennett, wife of the leftist president of Union Theological Seminary and a pacifist in her own right; Allan Brick, an official of the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation; Representative John Conyers, an ultra-leftist; and Rev. Peter Jenkins, a British pacifist. The Study Team, as might have been predicted, compiled an extremely critical report on the Saigon government and alleged that religious and political suppression was widespread. Many anonymous sources were used to prove the Study Team's case.

In 1968, Drinan was a member of the Civil Liberties Legal Defense Fund in support of baby doctor Benjamin Spock and four of his colleagues – all of them veteran anti-Vietnam War demonstrators – who were under indictment for conspiring to counsel young men to violate draft laws. In 1969, Drinan joined with other leftwing clergymen in support of the so-called Vietnam Moratorium and, at the same time, called for an immediate cessation of all United States offensive military action in Vietnam.

In 1969, Drinan became a trustee of the presumptuously titled National Citizens Commitee for Broadcasting, which claims as its purpose: "to end the threat to our children's taste and sensitivity posed by exposure to the current level of TV and radio programming." The NCCB was formed in the fall of 1968 when someone in the hierarchy of leftwing do-gooders finally discovered that television had become "an insult to the taste, imagination, intelligence and human feelings of millions of our fellow citizens." The would-be reformers, along with Drinan, included such leftwing luminaries as John Kenneth Galbraith, Adolf A. Berle, Michael Harrington, Richard Goodwin, Jules Feiffer, Gerard Piel, A. Philip Randolph, Arthur Miller, Archibald MacLeish, Nathan Glazer, Harry Belafonte, Saul Bellow, Dore Schary, and the NCCB's chairman, Thomas P.F. Hoving.

On February 26, 1970, Drinan announced that he was resigning as vice president of Boston College and taking a leave of absence as dean of the B.C. Law School in order to promote his candidacy for Congress from Massachusetts' third congressional district.

TILFORD DUDLEY was born on April 21, 1907 in Charleston, Illinois, son of Esther Shoot and Gerry Dudley. He married Martha Ward. He is an alumnus of Wesleyan University (Ph.B., 1928) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1931). At Wesleyan, he was a leader of the socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy.

From 1931 until 1934, Dudley practiced law in Aurora, Illinois. From 1934 until 1944, he held positions in the New

Deal: as chief of the legal section in the land program of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (1934-1935); chief of the land section in the Resettlement Administration (1935-1937); chief of land acquisition in the National Park Service (1936-1937); trial examiner of the National Labor Relations Board (1937-1942); and principal mediation officer (1942-1943), director of disputes (1943-1944), and principal administrative officer (1944) of the National War Labor Board. During Dudley's New Deal years, he was affiliated with the Washington Bookshop ("subversive and Communist"); the Washington Committee for Aid to China ("Communist-controlled"); and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action ("subversive and Communist"). In 1945, he was affiliated with the Council for Pan American Democracy ("subversive and Communist" – "Communist front").

In 1944 and 1945, Dudley was associate general counsel of the United Packinghouse Workers of America and the union's Washington (D.C.) representative. In 1945 and 1946, he was assistant to Sidney Hillman, chairman of the C.I.O.'s Political Action Committee. (At the same time, Hillman was the leader of the American Labor Party, a political front organization of the Communist Party. Through the ALP, the Communists were able to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label. Hillman formed the CIO-PAC in the hope of achieving a complete takeover of the Democrat Party.) From 1946 until 1955, Dudley was assistant director of the CIO-PAC. From 1955 until 1958, he was assistant director of the AFL-CIO's Committee on Political Education. (In 1955, the year of the AFL-CIO merger, the political arms of the AFL [the League of Political Education] and the CIO [the CIO-PAC] were consolidated into the Committee on Political Education, which was dominated by Walter Reuther from the beginning and until his death in 1970. COPE has always worked for socialist-oriented political candidates, especially within the Democrat Party.) From 1958 until 1969, Dudley was assistant director of the AFL-CIO's Speakers Bureau. Since 1969, he has been national affairs director in the Council for Christian Social Action of the United Church of Christ.

Dudley has been active in the leftist-oriented National Council of Churches: as a member of the executive board in the division of Christian life and work (1954-1957; 1964); a member of the NCC's general board (1954-1957; 1964); and a member of the executive board of the NCC's division of life and mission (1965).

Dudley has been an active Democrat: an alternate member to the Democratic National Committee (1948-1952); delegate to the Democratic National Convention (1948, 1952, 1960, and 1968); and vice chairman (1964-1967) and chairman (1967-1968) of the Democrat Central Committee in Washington, D.C.

Dudley is a member of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. He is a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century. He has been a sponsor of the leftist-pacifist Washington [D.C.] Peace Center.

ABRAHAM EDEL was born on December 6, 1908 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, son of Fannie Malamud and Simon Edel. He married May Mandelbaum. He is an alumnus of McGill University (B.A., 1927; M.A., 1928); Oxford University (B.A., 1930); and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1934). He held a Guggenheim fellowship in 1944 and 1945. He received grants from the Rockefeller Foundation in 1952 and 1953 and the National Science Foundation in 1959 and 1960. He is the author of *The Theory and Practice of Philosophy* (1946); *Ethical Judgment: The Use of Science in Ethics* (1955); *Science and the Structure of Ethics* (1961); *Method in Ethical Theory* (1963); and *Aristotle* (1967).

Since 1931, Edel has been at City College of New York, where he is currently a professor of philosophy. Since 1958, he has been a professorial lecturer in the department of psychiatry at the State University of New York's medical center in Brooklyn.

Edel has been affiliated with the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – "a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and 'Soviet culture' "); the Stockholm Peace Appeal ("Communist Party campaign"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); Social Workers Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("Communist front"); *Science and Society* ("Communist publication"); and the Universities Committee for Problems of War and Peace, a leftwing-pacifist group opposed to U.S. participation in the Vietnam War.

CLARK M. EICHELBERGER was born on July 29, 1896 in Freeport, Illinois, son of Olive Clark and Joseph Eichelberger. He married Rosa Kohler. He studied at Northwestern University (1914-1917) and the University of Chicago (1919-1920). He is the author of *The United Nations Charter: What Was Done at San Francisco; UN: The First Ten Years; UN: The First Fifteen Years;* and *UN: The First Twenty Years.*

From 1922 until 1928, Eichelberger was employed as a lecturer on national and international affairs by the Radcliffe Chautauqua System.

From 1929 until 1934, Eichelberger was the director of the midwest office of the League of Nations Association, and from 1934 until 1945, he was the LNA's national director. From 1945 until 1964, he was national director of its successor organization, the American Association for the United Nations. Meanwhile, Eichelberger was director (1939-1948), chairman (1964-1968), and since 1968, executive director of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, the research arm, successively, of the League of Nations Association, the American Association for the United Nations, and the United Nations Association of the United States.

From 1929 until the outbreak of World War II, Eichelberger worked tirelessly on behalf of world government. In 1940 and 1941, he diverted some of his energy to the directorship of a liberal-interventionist group, Defend America by Aiding the Allies. In 1942 and 1943, he became a consultant to the State Department and began a close relationship with Alger Hiss. (Eichelberger was a member of a five-man committee to prepare the first working draft of the United Nations Charter. In 1945, he was a consultant to the U.S. delegation at the organizing conference of the United Nations at San Francisco. Alger Hiss was the Secretary General of that conference.

Later, Eichelberger, according to former Secretary of War Robert Patterson, collaborated with Hiss in organizing the so-called Marshall Plan. In October 1947, Eichelberger joined Alger Hiss and Philip Jessup to file a brief in the Supreme Court of the United States. The object of the brief was to transfer vital areas of sovereignty from the United States to the United Nations. Subsequently, when Hiss was on trial for perjury with respect to his denial of Communist associations, Eichelberger was a voluntary character witness for Hiss.)

After 1945, the American Association for the United Nations was a very effective vehicle for Eichelberger's labors on behalf of world government and his other interests, which included unilateral disarmament for the United States and American support for Red China's admission to United Nations membership.

Eichelberger considers the United Nations to be a sovereign body and the beginning of world government and world law. He is adamantly opposed to American nationalism and considers the sovereignty of the United States as something eventually to be surrendered in its entirety to the United Nations.

Under Eichelberger's leadership, the American Association for the United Nations became the most important group of supporters for the United Nations in this country. Its officers, advisors, members, and sponsors have included members of the far left wing of the Democrat Party, the most extreme group of "modern" Republicans, the Red China lobby, the left wing of organized labor, the leadership of left-wing political groups and pacifist organizations, the leftwing clergy, and also soft-on-Communism State Department functionaries, executives of foundations that have made substantial contributions to the socialization of the United States, disarmament tacticians, inveterate Communist fronters, and vociferous anti-anti-Communists.

In 1964, Eichelberger was shunted aside in favor of Porter McKeever, who assumed the national directorship of the United Nations Association of the United States, a merger of the Eichelberger-led American Association for the United Nations and the United States Committee for the United Nations. Eichelberger, however, retained his influence in the newly-formed UNAUS through his position as executive director of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, the research arm of the UNAUS.

More than anyone else, Eichelberger was responsible for the continuity and growth of the AAUN and the UNAUS. Under his leadership, the organization received the support of the New Deal-Fair Deal-Modern Republican-New Frontier-Great Society Establishment: Eugenie Anderson, Detlev Bronk, Ralph Bunche, Benjamin V. Cohen, Andrew Cordier, Joseph E. Davies, Arthur H. Dean, Helen Gahagan Douglas, John Foster Dulles, Luther Evans, Thomas K. Finletter, Arthur Goldberg, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Frank P. Graham, Ernest Gross, Alger Hiss, Paul Hoffman, Hubert Humphrey, Philip Jessup, Joseph E. Johnson, Grayson Kirk, Arthur Larson, Herbert Lehman, Sol Linowitz, G. Bernard Noble, Eleanor and Anna Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Adlai Stevenson, Charles P. Taft, James J. Wadsworth, Sumner Welles, and Charles W. Yost. From organized labor came James B. Carey, James G. Patton, Jacob Potofsky, and Walter Reuther. From the Red China Lobby came Doak Barnett, John K. Fairbank, Owen Lattimore, Nathaniel Peffer, and Edwin O. Reischauer. They were joined by individuals whose names have repeatedly appeared on letterheads of various leftist organizations: Roger Baldwin, Bruce Bliven, Cass Canfield, Bartley Crum, Virginius Dabney, Albert Einstein, Douglas Fairbanks Jr., Dorothy Canfield Fisher, Palmer Hoyt, Robert W. Kenny, Benjamin Kizer, Thomas S. Mann, G. Bromley Oxnam, Arthur Upham Pope, Guy Emery Shipler, James T. Shotwell, Rex Stout, Anna Lord Strauss, Telford Taylor, Channing Tobias, J. Raymond Walsh, and Thomas J. Watson.

Beyond his own activities with the AAUN-UNAUS, Eichelberger has lent his name and prestige to many other groups. His affiliations have included: the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the American Student Union ("Communist front"); the Committee for Concerted Peace Efforts ("Communist front"); the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("subversive and un-American"); the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation ("Communist front"); the American Youth Congress ("subversive and Communist"); World Youth Congress ("Communist conference"); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); the United World Federalists (leftwing-internationalist); the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States); the League for Industrial Democracy (Socialist); and the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – "Communist front").

MAURICE N. EISENDRATH was born on July 10, 1902 in Chicago, son of Clara Oestericher and Nathan Eisendrath. He was married to the late Rosa Brown. He is married to Rita Hands. He is an alumnus of the University of Cincinnati (A.B., 1925) and Hebrew Union College of Cincinnati (D.D., 1945). He was ordained a rabbi in 1926.

From 1926 until 1929, Eisendrath served the congregation of the Virginia Street Temple in Charleston, West Virginia, and from 1929 until 1943, the congregation of Holy Blossom Temple in Toronto, Canada.

In 1943, Eisendrath became director of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations. In 1946, he became president of the Union, and in 1952, he was named lifetime president.

Eisendrath has been affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"). He has been a national sponsor of the ultra-leftwing, pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been on the national advisory board of the ultra-leftwing, globalist United World Federalists. He has been honorary president of Promoting Enduring Peace, an ultra-leftwing, pacifist organization which distributes so-called peace literature, emphasizing the theme that enduring peace can be achieved through one world of cooperation, especially through the United Nations. He has been a very harsh critic of United States participation in the Vietnam War. At the 1969 general assembly of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, he made one of his most widely publicized speeches, during which he followed the leftwing line that youths should increase their rebellious efforts to offset President Nixon's "sleight of hand" tactics in Vietnam. According to Eisendrath, peace moratorium programs were not enough to satisfy the protesting American youths: "Let there be no delusions. Our youth will not – and should not – be silent so long as the obscenity of Vietnam drags on, with its unconscionable toll of weekly deaths, its incalculable damage to the spirit and fiber of American life. Nor will they be hoodwinked by the sleight of hand timing of off again-on again bombing halts, token withdrawals and diminution of draft calls cynically synchronized to college reopenings." Eisendrath then threw gasoline on the fires of campus revolts by offering a totally unwarranted analogy: "How many more kids are going to be killed while we gear our military tactics to quell campus unrest rather than to the more honest quest for peace?"

BROOKS EMENY was born on July 29, 1901 in Salem, Ohio, son of Elizabeth Brooks and Frederick Emeny. He was married to the late Winifred Rockefeller. He is married to Barbara Cox. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1924) and Yale University (Ph.D., 1934). From 1924 until 1927, he pursued graduate studies at the Sorbonne in Paris, the London School of Economics, and the Konsular Akademie in Vienna. He is co-author of *The Great Powers in World Politics* and *The Price of Peace,* and author of *Mainsprings of World Politics* and *Strategy of Raw Materials.*

From 1927 until 1931, Emeny was an instructor in government at Yale University. From 1931 until 1935, he was engaged in research and writing in Washington, D.C. From 1935 until 1937, he was an associate professor of international relations at Cleveland College. From 1935 until 1942, he was director of the Foreign Affairs Council, a one-world group. From 1943 until 1947, he was president of the World Affairs Council, a pivotal agency in a complex of one-world, leftist, and pacifist groups, which became a major propaganda arm for the United Nations. Since 1947 he has been a member of the Foreign Policy Association's board of directors, and from 1947 until 1953 was president of the Association. (The Foreign Policy Association has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism. It has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists.)

From 1940 until 1953, Emeny was on the Institute of Pacific Relations' board of directors. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee found the IPR to be "a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives" and an "instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence."

Emeny has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Since 1941, he has been frequently called upon as a consultant by the State Department. In 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1960, he was a lecturer under the auspices of the leftist-oriented United States Information Service. From 1956 until 1959, he was chairman of the foreign affairs committee for the White House Conference on the People-to-People Program, one of the Eisenhower Administration's major projects to promote "coexistence" with the Soviet Union.

Emeny's penchant for one-worldism has been furthered by his membership in the Atlantic Council of the United States, an organization which stresses the need for closer cooperation, especially economic, between the United States and the Socialist nations of western Europe. He is an advisor to the international organization research program at Syracuse University's Maxwell Graduate School, to Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, and to American University's School of International Service – all of which are centers of leftwing internationalism.

IRVING M. ENGEL was born on October 19, 1891 in Birmingham, Alabama, son of Sophie Kronenberg and Michael Engel. He was married to the late Katharine Asher. He is an alumnus of Yale University (LL.B., 1913).

From 1913 until 1924, Engel practiced law in Birmingham. Since 1925, he has practiced in New York. From 1954 until 1959, he was president of the American Jewish Committee.

Engel has long been active in the affairs of the Democratic Party. He was an alternate delegate to the Democratic National Conventions of 1952 and 1956. He has been an official of the New York Committee for Democratic Voters and the Democratic State Advisory Committee. In 1950, he was a candidate for Congress on the Democratic and Liberal tickets. In 1960, he was chairman of the political and planning committee of New York Citizens for Kennedy and Johnson.

He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He has been a member of Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee, a leftist one-world group. He has been a member of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. In 1964, he was on the Norman Thomas Eightieth Birthday Anniversary Committee in a tribute to the patriarch of the Socialist Party.

LUTHER EVANS was born on October 13, 1902 in Sayersville, Texas, son of Lillie Johnson and George Evans. He married Helen Murphy. He is an alumnus of the University of Texas (A.B., 1923; M.A., 1924) and Stanford University (Ph.D., 1927).

From 1924 until 1927, he was instructor of the freshman orientation course at Stanford University. In 1927 and 1928, he was an instructor in government at New York University. From 1928 until 1930, he was a political science instructor at Dartmouth College. From 1930 until 1935, he was an assistant professor of politics at Princeton University.

From 1935 until 1939, Evans was director of a historical records survey in the Works Progress Administration. Harold Lord Varney, writing in *American Mercury*, February 1954, made some interesting observations about Evans' career in the WPA: "Evans, a Socialist and former lecturer for the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy, first appeared on the Washington scene in 1935 as one of the odd group, mostly Marxists, which clustered about Henry G. Alsberg in the American Guide project of the WPA. He won the interest of [Archibald] MacLeish, then riding high as Librarian of Congress and White House intimate, and was appointed to an executive post in the Library of Congress."

From 1939 until 1953, Evans was in the Library of Congress: as director of the legislative reference (1939-1940); chief assistant librarian and acting-librarian (1940-1945); and from 1945 until 1953, Librarian of Congress.

As well as introducing Evans to his long career in the Library of Congress, Archibald MacLeish ushered him into the high echelons of the Communist-saturated and Communist-dominated UNESCO. From 1946 until 1952, Evans was a member of the U.S. National Commission to UNESCO. From 1953 until 1958, he was in Paris as Director-General of UNESCO, and from 1959 until 1963, he was again a member of the U.S. National Commission to UNESCO.

From 1959 until 1961, Evans was with the Brookings Institute as director of a survey of federal departmental libraries. In 1961 and 1962, he was with the National Education Association as director of a project on the educational implications of automation. Since 1962, he has been at Columbia University as director of international and legal collections.

Evans is a long-time official of the American Civil Liberties Union. He has been affiliated with the leftwing-globalist International Movement for Atlantic Union and the American Association for the United Nations. As a leftwing pacifist, he was an organizer of the World Conference on the Role of Universities in Quest for Peace and chairman of the executive committee of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.

CLIFTON FADIMAN was born on May 15, 1904 in New York City, son of Grace and Isidore Fadiman. His first wife was Pauline Rush. He is married to Annalee Whitmore. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1925). He is the author of *Party of One* (1955); *Any Number Can Play* (1957); *Fantasia Mathematica* (1958); *The Lifetime Reading Plan* (1959); *Enter Conversing* (1962); *Wally the Wordworm* (1964); and *Fifty Years* (1965). He has been a great influence in the publishing world as a well-known judge for the Book-of-the-Month Club, whose selections have always been weighted heavily in favor of leftist-liberal authors. He has been a consultant for Encyclopaedia Britannica Films, notable for a leftist output. (Since 1959, he has also been on the board of editors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica.)

From 1925 until 1927, Fadiman was an English teacher at Ethical Culture High School in New York City. From 1925 until 1933, he was a lecturer at Peoples Institute. From 1927 until 1939, he was associated with Simon and Schuster, book publishers, as assistant editor (1927-1929); editor (1929-1935); and editorial adviser (1936-1939). From 1933 until 1943, he was book editor for *The New Yorker*. From 1938 until 1948, he was master of ceremonies for "Information Please," a radio program. From 1954 until 1957, he was master of ceremonies for "Conversation," a radio program. He has been a consultant for the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, a creation of leftwinger Robert M. Hutchins. In 1967, he was regents lecturer at the University of California at Los Angeles. He has contributed articles to many magazines and has made frequent television appearances as a master of ceremonies and panelist.

In the 1930's and early 1940's Fadiman had a very close relationship with Communists and Socialists. He was affiliated with the National Committee to Aid Striking Miners Fighting Starvation (Communist front); the National Committee to Aid Victims of German Fascism (Communist front); Workers International Relief (Communist front); the American Committee for Anti-Nazi German Seamen ("Communist front"); the American Relief Ship for Spain ("Communist project"); the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo ("Communist front"); the Sunnyside Discussion

Group ("Communist front"); the National Committee against Censorship of the Theatre Arts ("Communist front"); and the Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee ("Communist front"). (In September 1932, Fadiman contributed an article to the Communists' *New Masses* magazine. In the March 6, 1934 issue of *New Masses*, he was signatory to a letter, directed to the Communist Party, expressing support of Communism and deploring the attacks on Communists at a Socialist Party meeting.)

In 1947, Fadiman was an organizer of the leftist-globalist United World Federalists. He has been a member of the leftwing-pacifist Society for the Prevention of World War III. He has been a member of Freedom House's Bookshelf Committee, which promotes books by notable liberal-leftists.

BERNARD T. FELD was born on December 21, 1919 in Brooklyn, son of Helen Taub and A. Louis Field. He married Eliza McCormick. He is an alumnus of the City College of New York (B.S., 1939) and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1945).

In 1941 and 1942, Feld was a physicist on the Manhattan (A-bomb) Project at Columbia University. From 1942 until 1944, he was a group leader in the Metallurgical Laboratory at the University of Chicago. From 1944 until 1946, he was a physicist in the Science Laboratory at Los Alamos. In 1946, he joined the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; since 1957 he has been a professor of physics, and from 1961 until 1963, he was chairman of the directing committee at MIT's Laboratory of Nuclear Science. In 1953 and 1954, he was a visiting professor at the University of Rome and the University of Padua. In 1960 and 1961, he was a visiting scientist at the European Center for Nuclear Research. In 1966 and 1967, he was a visiting professor at the École Polytechnique in Paris. He is a consultant to AVCO Corporation and Raytheon Corporation. He is a member of the executive committee of the Cambridge (Mass.) Electron Accelerator.

Feld is a veteran of the Pugwash Conferences between Americans and Soviets. (The conferences have had the overriding objective of promoting United States disarmament as an accommodation toward the "peace-loving" Soviet Union.) Feld has been an official of the Federation of American Scientists, a group of bleeding-heart, leftwing pacifists. He has served as president of the Council for a Livable World, an ultra-leftwing pacifist and political pressure group that makes a special appeal to the scientific community. It lobbies for a ban on all underground nuclear tests; a drastic reduction in military spending; abolition of all restrictions on East-West trade; an end to travel bans that prevent Americans from visiting North Vietnam, Red China, and Communist Cuba; and a "non-aligned Viet Nam." Feld has served on the advisory council of the Peace Research Institute (now the Institute for Policy Studies), one of the most prestigious organizations in the entire leftwing peace movement. He has been a member of the leftist-pacifist Civil Defense Letter Committee. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

WILBUR H. (PING) FERRY was born on December 17, 1910 in Detroit, Michigan, son of Fay Rutson and Hugh Ferry. He married Jolyne Gillier. He is an alumnus of Dartmouth College (A.B., 1932). He is the author of *The Corporation and the Economy* (1959); *The Economy under Law* (1961); *Caught on the Horn of Plenty* (1962); *What Price Peace* (1963); and *Masscomm as Educator* (1966).

In 1932 and 1933, Ferry was an instructor at Choate School. (Nineteen years later, in a name-dropping gesture, he reminded an audience that one of his Choate pupils was John F. Kennedy.) Between 1933 and 1940, he was a reporter for the *Manchester* (N.H.) *Union Leader* and the *Concord* (N.H.) *Daily Monitor,* and a publicity director for Eastern Airlines. Between 1940 and 1944, he was a press officer for the Red-lined and Red-controlled International Labor Organization, the publicity director for Sidney Hillman's Communist-supported National Citizens Political Action Committee, and the chief investigator in New Hampshire for the Office of Price Administration.

From 1945 until 1954, he was a partner in Earl Newsom & Co., a public relations firm. In this position, "he became a speech writer for Henry Ford II and, as *Time* Magazine once put it, did 'think' work for the Ford Foundation. [Robert Maynard] Hutchins brought him into the Fund [for the Republic] a year ago [1954], and he is reported to have told several friends that he considers his primary task there to be to convince the public that there never has been any Communist menace domestically, that the whole threat is a myth dreamed up by reactionary elements." (Russell Turner, "Fund for Which Republic?" *Human Events,* September 24, 1955.)

Ferry remained with the Fund for the Republic and its spawn, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, as a vice president and fellow until May 1959, when Robert Hutchins in a sudden move ousted Ferry from the Center.

Ferry's duties and responsibilities at the Fund and the Center were never too onerous or time-consuming to prevent him from engaging feverishly in leftwing activities. He has been affiliated with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Welcoming Committee for Kaoru Yasui (a Japanese Communist brought to the United States under Communist auspices); *Minority of One* (a propaganda forum for leftwing pacifists, Communists, and fellow travelers); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); the National Committee of 1000 to Elect Peace Candidates in 1962; the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam; Individuals against the Crime of Silence (a peacenik group); the National Conference for New Politics (largely controlled by Communists); the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee (the "three" were soldiers who evaded service in Vietnam); the Voters' Pledge Campaign (to elect peace candidates in 1966); Defenders of 3 against HUAC (these "three" were in contempt of Congress); the Civil Liberties Legal Defense Fund (to defend five who were indicted for conspiring to counsel young men to violate the draft laws); the Inter-University Committee for a Public Hearing on Vietnam (the "teach-in" movement exploited by the Communists for their own purposes); and Students for a Democratic Society (the flaming Red offspring of the League for Industrial Democracy).

In 1967, Ferry joined in a memorial tribute to the recently deceased Abraham J. Muste, one of the deans of America's Red radicals. In 1965, when *Monthly Review* published a memorial issue to Marxist Paul Baran, Ferry wrote a tribute to Baran, as did also Ché Guevara, Palmiro Togliatti, and Oscar Lange. In 1965, Ferry, who had never served in the armed forces, made a "declaration of conscience" (sponsored by leading leftwing pacifist groups): "We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development."

For many years, one of Ferry's main obsessions was criticism of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. While with the leftwing PAC in 1944, Ferry blasted the FBI for allegedly exaggerating the dangers of Soviet espionage in this country. On January 2, 1958, the *Ossining* [N.Y.] *Citizen-Register* published a letter from Ferry criticizing the newspaper for publishing a report that placed Hoover in a favorable light. Ferry charged that the *Citizen-Register* accepted Hoover's claims of the FBI's accomplishments but did not ask Hoover for proof of the claims. If Communist spies and saboteurs were a genuine threat, Ferry wanted to know why more of them were not brought to trial. (By way of a *non sequitur,* Ferry observed that the Communist Party "appears to be falling apart at the seams.") He was particularly incensed over the fact that the FBI used informants – a practice that indicated to him a latent danger that the FBI could become a national secret police.

On August 6, 1962, Ferry returned to his anti-FBI, anti-Hoover theme. The occasion was a thirteen-state conference of Western Democrats at Seattle. Said Ferry: "The subject of Communism in the United States is a mischief-making tapestry of legend and illusion if there ever was one . . . . What is the legend that haunts and cripples us here? It is that the Communists are nine feet tall, craftier than Satan, the most expert managers the world has ever seen, not human beings like ourselves but a race apart, determined to put man and God into jail forever." The responsibility for perpetuation of the legend and illusion, according to Ferry, belonged to Hoover as much as to any individual.

In language reminiscent of his 1944 and 1958 utterances, Ferry said: " . . . Mr. Hoover warns against Soviet espionage in the United States. This is an old line of the FBI chief, and its success year after year is a tribute to the trance into which his sermons throw Americans, not excepting Congressmen. Mr. Hoover is, after all, our official spy-swatter. In these persistent reports about espionage and sabotage, is he delicately telling us that he isn't up to the job, that Red spies are running loose despite his best efforts? If in fact we are as infested with these rascals, as Mr. Hoover intimates, it might occur to many people that the country needs a more efficient spy-swatter. No one cares to have spies and saboteurs percolating through the republic, and if the FBI is not up to finding and prosecuting them, let us get an agency that can. Congress never grudges Mr Hoover a penny. So, since he does not produce many flesh-and-blood spies and saboteurs year after year, he apparently feels he must keep up the supply of clandestine and possible unreal ones."

With very few exceptions, editorialists and syndicated columnists throughout the country reacted sharply against Ferry and his senseless attacks against Hoover and the FBI. Even Attorney General Robert Kennedy – no anti-Communist – felt constrained to rebuke Ferry: "Communism is a very serious threat, and anyone who underestimates the danger of that threat is doing a disservice to the country."

Ferry's inanities have not been confined to his anti-FBI tirades. On January 13, 1960, the *Santa Barbara News-Press* published a letter from Ferry. "Mr. Ferry urged our country to junk all its weapons 'of whatever kind' in unilateral disarmament and found it necessary 'to accept as a possibility' that 'this country would be taken over by the Reds' and so would the Western European countries 'for which our arms are used to provide a shield.' Though such a Communist conquest is 'a desperate and repellent vision' to Mr. Ferry, he nevertheless finds it 'thinkable,' and urges unilateral disarmament upon us as 'an alternative to our present policy.' " (Alice Widener, *U.S.A.*, August 24-September 6, 1962, page 9.)

A few months before Ferry made his famous speech at Seattle, the Fund for the Republic published and distributed his *Caught on the Horn of Plenty.* It was nothing less than a call for the imposition of a Marxian government and economy upon the United States. Ferry summarized his thesis as follows: "The United States is advancing rapidly into a national economy in which there will not be enough jobs of the conventional kind to go around. The acceleration of technology is responsible. A social and political crisis will be the result. Substitutes for such presently accepted goals as full employment will have to be found. Fresh definitions of the conceptions of work, leisure, abundance, and scarcity are needed. Economic theories adequate to an industrial revolution are not good enough for the conditions of the scientific revolution. The complexity and interdependence of the scientific industrial state calls for national planning. The individualism of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries is a casualty of technology, as are old theories of private property. Government must intervene more and more in the nation's industrial life. The destiny is the economy under law. A radical change in public attitude toward law and government is necessary if the general welfare is to be achieved. Having bargained for the benefits of technology on all fronts, law is our only means of assuring that it serves the common good."

Ferry advocated national and international economic planning. He proposed that unemployment insurance be used to provide a *permanent* dole, and that government corporations hand out so much "aid" that the "problem of abundance in the United States" would be eliminated and we could "return to a state of scarcity." He further proposed that "we shall have to find means, public or private, of paying people not to work," and to develop "a basis of distribution of income which is not tied to work as a measure."

In the fashion of the ultra-liberal left, Ferry has aroused his own long-dormant concern for Negroes. In his 1962 Seattle speech, he said: "Negroes are, in a precise sense, our colonial people and our colonial problem. They are the exploited and their communities [in the United States] are our domestic Algerias without, so far, the commotions of that torn country."

In the March 5, 1969 issue of *Now*, published by the Unitarian Universalist Association, Ferry wrote ("Black Colonies: A Final Solution"): "The word colonialism is distasteful to white Americans, even while they exclude blacks from any part of their lives. But it need not be a distasteful idea, for there has been enlightened as well as brutal colonialism; and it must not be, for it is the concept on which the only durable relationship between white and black can be built. Colonialism is, moreover, the *de facto* condition of black America. Inasmuch as this condition has remained relatively unaltered for generations despite occasional white seizures of guilt, the best course obviously is to make the arrangement legitimate.

"Hence I propose the formal establishment of a system of black colonies in the United States. The system will be directed by a Department of Colonial Affairs in Washington, with a Secretary of Cabinet rank at its head. Geography and population will determine the location of the several colonies. Any area a mile square or more in size, having a population of more than 25,000, and containing 75% or more black inhabitants will be deemed of potential colonial status. The inner city of most major American cities will automatically qualify. Harlem, the Watts-Compton area of Los Angeles, Chicago's South Side, the east-central section of Detroit – all these and numerous others already meet virtually any criterion of colonial possession that might be established . . . . "

From the pen of someone else, Ferry's "black colonies" plan might appear to be an attempt – no matter how inept – at heavy-handed humor. But Ferry is no humorist. He offered detailed plans for the political and economic structure of the "colonies," their relationship to the United States and foreign countries, and, for a solution to the fiscal problems that were bound to face new "colonies," he suggested a $1000 per capita grant to each colony from the United States.

By Ferry's logic: "Black colonies will testify to the two billion non-white people around the globe the essential light in which Americans regard them. From this and other points of view black colonies are not, to be sure, a very palatable solution. Some might even call it un-American. But it is scarcely more un-American than the millions of slights visited daily on black citizens by white citizens. The colonial proposal has the virtue of displaying concretely and forthrightly how the majority of our citizens feel about 20 million black Americans as evidenced by vote after vote, poll after poll, by one school board squabble after another, one indignity after another, by every open and covert device of white America."

GEORGE FIELD was born on December 20, 1904 in New York City, son of Rose Polay and David Field. He married Molly Mass. He attended evening classes for a few semesters at New York University.

From 1926 until 1928, Field was a copywriter. From 1929 until 1932, he was a free-lance advertising agent. From 1932 until 1936, he worked in radio publicity. In 1936, at the age of thirty-two, he was chairman of the board of the Rand School of Social Science in New York City. (The Rand School was established in 1906. It was originally owned by the American Socialist Society and was heavily financed for many years by the Garland Fund, which was a major source of financing for Communist Party enterprises. In 1933, when the Rand

School was in financial distress, the Socialist Party and fellow travelers came to its rescue. By the time George Field became Rand's chairman of the board, the Socialist Party had saved the school, which catered not only to Socialists but also to assorted radicals of the left.)

In 1937, Field wrote the American Labor Party Political Handbook for Fiorello La Guardia's mayoralty campaign. (In that same year, the entire membership of the Communist Party had been instructed to join the American Labor Party.)

In 1937, Field began a three-year stint as program director for Radio Station WEVD in New York City. (WEVD, named in honor of Eugene Victor Debs, one of America's earliest Bolsheviks, was founded in 1927 by the Socialist Party. The Station was nothing less than a propaganda outlet for Communists, Socialists, and other radicals of the left, including the *grande dame* of the Left, Eleanor Roosevelt.)

From 1938 until 1963, Field was the director of WEVD's University of the Air, a program that presented a forum for the most extreme leftists from political, labor, and educational circles. And WEVD's audience was barraged by Communist and Socialist propaganda in the guise of lectures, panel discussions, and dramas. (The Station lived up to its original purpose "to champion the cause of liberty and social justice in the broad and liberal spirit of Eugene V. Debs," who, in an address to a Socialist Party gathering, had said: "I am going to speak to you as a Socialist, as a Revolutionist, and as a Bolshevist, if you please.")

In 1940 and 1941, aside from his duties with WEVD, Field was secretary of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Allies, one of the many interventionist, warmongering groups that arose in that era.

In 1941, Field was a founder of Freedom House. Writing in the *New York Times* (August 24, 1966), Barnard L. Collier presented the dramatic beginnings: "Just 37 days before the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor and plunged the United States into World War II, Freedom House was established in New York. It was George Field's idea. Under one roof would go most of the major organizations that had concluded that the United States participation in the war was right, good and inevitable." (From 1941 until 1966, Field was Freedom House's executive director.)

At the time of the Collier piece, Field announced his retirement as Freedom House's executive director; he became the organization's secretary. And Collier reminisced: "Freedom House, of course, is no longer concerned with being an answer to Hitler's Braunhaus in Munich. But it is still dedicated to the ideas in its original articles of incorporation: '. . . resisting the totalitarian movement now threatening civilization . . . in terms of the aspirations of all peoples for a world of freedom, peace and security; to promote the concrete application of the principles of freedom and democracy in the everyday affairs of the U.S.A., governmental and otherwise, so that by sacrifice, intelligence and justice this country can be an example to both the present and post-war world of democracy at its best . . . .' It was easy to operate Freedom House during the war, Mr. Field says, 'because we were practically the civilian spokesman against totalitarianism.' Since then, with nothing so black and white anymore, Freedom House has steered a course that is described by Mr. Field as 'centerist' – always well reasoned, now and then in advance of the times, seldom at odds with the Government but constantly constructively critical."

Roscoe Drummond, chairman of the board of trustees of Freedom House, described Field as the organization's "careful guiding force" and said, "If we wanted money or an important 'name' to back up our policy statements, we'd call on George and he'd do it."

According to its promotional literature: "The positive position of Freedom House, conveyed by its name, is necessarily coupled with a strong anti-Communist posture. Since it is *for* freedom, it is *against* tyranny. Since it is *for* representative democracy, it is *against* all kinds of dictatorship. And it regards aggressive dictatorships as the greatest threat to peace." To make the "strong anti-Communist posture" viable, Freedom House has had on its board of trustees representatives of what some overly charitable critics would describe as the anti-Communist left. In reality, George Field and his successor as executive secretary, Leonard Sussman, have been surrounded by Socialists, Communist fronters, pacifists, ban-the-bomb advocates, architects of appeasement, vigorous enemies of anti-Communist investigations, internationalists, and inveterate anti-anti-Communists. The trustees have been generally drawn from the ranks of liberal Democrats, holding strong ties with such leftwing groups as Americans for Democratic Action, the Council on Foreign Relations, the National Committee for an Effective Congress, the Anti-Defamation League and the League for Industrial Democracy. The few Republicans who have been on the Freedom House board have been drawn from the "modern Republican" group that coalesced during the Eisenhower Administration. They may have included an occasional political innocent, but for the most part the individuals in Freedom House have been interlocking stalwarts of the Leftist Establishment: Herbert Agar, Irving Brown, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Ralph Bunche, Leo Cherne, Roscoe Drummond, Christopher Emmet, Richard N. Gardner, Harry Gideonse, Arthur J. Goldsmith, Paul Hoffman, Jacob Javits, J.M. Kaplan, Maxwell Kriendler, John Lindsay, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Daniel P. Moynihan, Bonaro Overstreet, James A. Pike, Whitelaw Reid, Mrs. Kermit Roosevelt, Elmo Roper, Eric Sevareid, Whitney North Seymour, Spyros Skouras, Rex Stout, Roy Wilkins, and Wendell Willkie.

One of Freedom House's practices is to present an annual Freedom Award. In not a single instance has the award been given to any individual who could be judged in any other light than as an anti-anti-Communist. The recipients of the award have included Dean Acheson, Willy Brandt, Pablo Casals, Winston Churchill, Lucius Clay, James B. Conant, Paul H. Douglas, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Paul Hoffman, Lyndon B. Johnson, George Kennan, David E. Lilienthal, Walter Lippmann, George C. Marshall, Jean Monnet, Luis Muñoz-Marin, Edward R. Murrow, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Paul-Henri Spaak, Harry S. Truman, Arthur H. Vandenberg, Earl Warren, Sumner Welles, and Roy Wilkins.

In 1959, a Freedom House Bookshelf program was instituted. Books selected by a committee ("America's foremost men of letters, scholars, composers, artists, historians and social scientists") are sent "to leaders and scholars in Africa, Asia and Latin America selected with the help of responsible American agencies operating in those areas."

The treasurer of the Bookshelf Committee has been Rex Stout, whose leftism does not seem to have mellowed since the days when he was one of the original publishing team of *New Masses,* a Communist weekly. The Bookshelf Committee has comprised the most brazen leftists in the literary and academic worlds: Gordon Allport, Cass Canfield, Bennett Cerf, Henry Steele Commager, James B. Conant, Norman Cousins, Foster Rhea Dulles, Clifton Fadiman, Erich Fromm, Buell Gallagher, Oscar Handlin, Granville Hicks, Howard Mumford Jones, Grayson Kirk, William L. Langer, Max Lerner, Archibald MacLeish, Ashley Montagu, Samuel Eliot Morison, Allan Nevins, Saul Padover, Elmer Rice, the Arthur Schlesingers, Junior and Senior, and Upton Sinclair. Also aiding in the selection of "the good books that make men's hearts catch fire" have been such other leftists as William Benton, Chester Bowles, Erwin Canham, Leo Cherne, Aaron Copland, William O. Douglas, Roscoe Drummond, Edward R. Murrow, and Ben Shahn.

By the standards of the Bookshelf Committee, "the writings of the foremost spokesmen of freedom" include works by committee members Max Lerner, Ashley Montagu, Bonaro Overstreet (in collaboration with her fellow-traveling husband), Saul Padover, and Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. Other recommended leftwing authors include Ruth Benedict, the Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas, Theodore Draper, J. Kenneth Galbraith, and Carl Sandburg. *Profiles in Courage* by John F. Kennedy is distributed by the Bookshelf Committee, but none of Herbert Hoover's or Douglas MacArthur's works are so favored. And the Freedom House's self-proclaimed "strong anti-Communist posture" evidently does not provide for its Bookshelf Committee to distribute a single volume of any sort that deals with the exposures of Communist espionage and subversion in the United States or of recent Communist aggression in any part of the world.

At the close of every year, Freedom House issues a report on the gains and losses of freedom throughout the world. The report receives generous publicity in the press. As might be expected, the evaluation does not approach the full truth about Communist advances. In recent years, "freedom" in the United States is studied only from the perspective of so-called civil rights, and by Freedom House's standards, freedom gains only if racist agitators have been successful. Also in recent years, Freedom House has devoted a great deal of attention to the Vietnam War, and in the annual progress reports, freedom is seen to have made gains as long as the Administration has clung to a no-win policy. (A military victory by the United States and its allies in Vietnam would be a blow to freedom, according to Freedom House.)

For 1969, Freedom House's annual report found net losses for freedom in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. Gains were made in western Europe and the United States. Eastern Europe did not change. The United States was urged to "remove its still grave racial, economic, and political inequities." The strongly anti-Communist nations of Portugal, Rhodesia, and South Africa were criticized. The election of the pro-Communist Willy Brandt as Chancellor of West Germany had demonstrated that nation's "continuity of responsible political action at the most sensitive point in Western Europe." (Brandt, of course, received the annual Freedom House Award while Field was the "careful guiding force" of Freedom House.)

RUTH PRUYN FIELD was born on May 5, 1907 in New York City, daughter of Betty Metcalf and Robert Pruyn. She married Marshall Field.

Since 1940, Mrs. Field has been an official of the Field Foundation: director since 1940; vice president (1957-1966); and since 1966, chairman. The Foundation has been extremely generous to leftwing civil rights groups. (On April 5, 1968, the Foundation's board of trustees voted to make a special donation of one million dollars to the civil rights movement in the South in memory of the late Martin Luther King Jr. Ordinarily, the Foundation granted $1,500,000 annually to various civil rights organizations.)

Mrs. Field has been on the national board of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. She has been on the board of directors of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda. She has been on the board of directors of the pro-Socialist Fund for the Republic and its offshoot, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. She has also been affiliated with the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness; the Southern Conference for Human Welfare ("Communist front"); and the leftwing-globalist United Nations Association of the United States.

ROBERT H. FINCH was born on October 9, 1925 in Tempe, Arizona, son of Gladys Hutchinson and Robert Finch. He married Carol Crother. He is an alumnus of Occidental College (B.A., 1947) and the University of Southern California (J.D., 1951). He was admitted to the California bar in 1951.

In 1947 and 1948, Finch was in Washington, D.C., as an administrative aide to Representative Norris Poulson (R.-Cal.). During his stay in Washington, Finch became a close friend and political associate of Richard M. Nixon. In 1948, Finch was active in Nixon's successful campaign for re-election to the House of Representatives.

By 1948, Finch was deeply enmeshed in politics. Aside from the Nixon campaign of that year, Finch was editor of the National Young Republican Federation's newspaper and was a delegate to the Republican National Convention.

In 1952 and 1954, Finch was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress. In 1956, he was again a delegate to the Republican National Convention. From 1956 until 1958, he was chairman of the Republican Central Committee of Los Angeles. From 1958 until 1966, he was a trustee of the Republican Associates of Los Angeles, and in 1964 and 1965 he was chairman of the group's executive committee.

From 1958 until 1960, Finch was Vice President Nixon's administrative assistant. In 1960, he managed Nixon's presidential campaign, and in 1962, he participated in – but did not manage – Nixon's unsuccessful gubernatorial campaign in California. In 1964, he managed George Murphy's successful campaign in California for the U.S. Senate.

In 1965, Finch began an intensive campaign on behalf of himself for the lieutenant-governorship of California. In the course of the campaign, he received help from his old friend, Richard M. Nixon, and in the 1966 election, Finch was victorious, receiving the largest majority ever won by a Republican in California.

From 1951 until 1969, Finch was a partner in a Los Angeles law firm. He also spent a few years in the savings and loan business. But his main preoccupation was politics, and especially his own and Richard Nixon's political fortunes.

Finch has said of himself: "I know I'm basically a political animal." He has also said: "I regard myself as a pragmatist." There is no doubt that he is a Republican. He has worked with a tireless loyalty for Republicans and the Republican Party on state and national levels. But he has never found his niche in either the conservative or moderate segments of the Republican Party.

For one who has been an active force in Republican politics for more than twenty years, Finch has been rather sparing in the quantity of his statements and writings. (He did co-author a book with Richard Cornuelle – *The New Conservative Liberal Manifesto* – but there is intrinsic evidence that the main contributor was the left-of-center Cornuelle.) When he has expressed himself on public issues, Finch either has been obtuse or else his certifiable liberalism has been in evidence. (He has an exceptional faculty for producing convoluted answers to direct questions and consequently he often is "all-things-to-all-men" on a particular issue.)

In 1968, Finch managed the successful presidential campaign of Richard M. Nixon. As a reward, Mr. Nixon offered him his choice of cabinet posts, and Finch opted for Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He took the job with the attitude that the statism and paternalism of HEW was unimpeachable, but that the Department would be more efficiently managed in a Republican administration than it had been under the Democrats.

Finch had no quarrel with the methods of his two immediate predecessors as head of HEW. As a matter of fact, the two ultra-leftists – John W. Gardner and Wilbur Cohen – gave Finch extensive and friendly briefings. Both Gardner and Cohen were quite optimistic that Finch would be faithful to their leftist traditions, and in turn Finch urged both men to accept positions in the Nixon Administration.

Once Finch was appointed to HEW, his liberalism was never in doubt, especially when he chose some of the nation's most notorious leftwing liberals for high positions in HEW, for Commissioner of Education, Finch selected James E. Allen Jr. of New York; there Allen's authoritarian zeal to integrate schools by using a busing program had incurred the wrath of New York's legislators. For the directorship of HEW's Office of Civil Rights, Finch called upon Leon Panetta, who had been a staff assistant to California's ultra-liberal U.S. Senator, Thomas Kuchel. (Panetta would later resign and embarrass the Nixon Administration, since he was bitterly critical of HEW's failure to integrate schools in the South at a faster pace.)

Finch suffered one severe setback when his choice of Dr. John Knowles as Assistant Secretary of HEW for Health and Scientific Affairs was unacceptable to the Senate. Knowles, one of the nation's busiest advocates of socialized medicine, was so incensed at being rejected that he made a dramatic and well-publicized resignation from the Republican Party. Instead of Knowles, Finch had to settle for Dr. Robert O. Egeberg, whose ultra-liberalism was a match for that of Knowles.

The most controversial choice made by Finch was that of James Farmer to be an Assistant Secretary of HEW. Farmer, who had tried to win election to Congress on the Liberal Party ticket, was a founder and national director of the Congress of Racial Equality. His racist agitation, over a quarter of a century, had made "police brutality" and "non-violence" nation-wide bywords to such an extent that Farmer deserved recognition as one of the country's most prominent "civil rights" radicals. During the Johnson Administration, there were plans to provide Farmer with a sinecure as head of a so-called anti-poverty agency that would have been financed by private and federal funds. The Farmer boondoggle, however, was one that the Johnson Democrats could not foist on the American people. Then, during the 1968 presidential campaign, Farmer spoke out strongly against Richard Nixon and endorsed Nelson Rockefeller. As a reward, he was told by Finch that in HEW he would be a powerful policy-making figure.

As Secretary of HEW, Finch has proven to be as extravagant a spender as any of his predecessors. His "welfare" programs become progressively heavier burdens for the American taxpayers. In the promotion of socialized medicine, Finch is making the wildest dreams of his ultra-leftist predecessors come true. But it is in the area of education that Finch has been busiest. From the beginning of his tenure, he has been at war with the South and seems determined to go to all lengths in order to racially integrate every school south of the Mason-Dixon line.

LAWRENCE S. FINKELSTEIN was born on March 11, 1925 in New York City, son of Sylvia Lemkin and Frank Finkelstein. He married Marina Salvin. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (B.A., 1944; M.A., 1947).

From 1944 until 1946, Finkelstein was on the staff of the division for dependent areas affairs in the Department of State. In 1946 and 1947, he worked in the trusteeship division of the United Nations Secretariat. From 1947 until 1949, he was a research assistant and lecturer in government at Columbia University. In 1949 and 1950, he was employed by the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. In 1950 and 1951, he was a researcher for the Institute of Pacific Relations and contributed articles to the IPR's publications, *Far Eastern Survey* (1950 and 1951) and *Pacific Affairs* (1951). (In 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported that the IPR had been "a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives" and as an "instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence.")

From 1952 until 1965, Finkelstein was with the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: as program director (1952-1957); director of studies (1957-1963); and vice president (1959-1965). (While at the Carnegie Endowment, Finkelstein was one of eight men who were subjects of a request by Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland for emergency security clearances in order that they might serve on an Advisory Committee on International Organization. Otto Otepka, in the State Department's Office of Security, advised against the clearances. This was one of the security measures taken by Otepka that caused him to lose his position.)

From 1958 until 1961, Finkelstein was at Columbia University: as instructor in government (1958-1959) and visiting lecturer at the School of International Affairs (1960-1961). In 1961 and 1962, he was a research associate at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs. From 1962 until 1965, he was a consultant on international organizations to the Department of State. In 1965 and 1966, he was a deputy assistant on internal security affairs to Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. From 1962 until 1967, he was a consultant to the Institute for Defense Analyses, a "think factory" financed for the most part by American taxpayers. From 1966 until 1969, he was a consultant to the Department of Defense.

In 1966 and 1967, Finkelstein was director of the Case-Western Reserve Study Commission. Since 1967, he has been at Brandeis University as associate dean of academic administration and acting dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

Finkelstein has been a sponsor of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council. He has been on the advisory council of the Peace Research Institute (now the Institute for Policy Studies), one of the most prestigious organizations in the entire leftwing peace movement. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

CLARK H. FOREMAN was born on February 19, 1902 in Atlanta, Georgia, son of Effie Howell and Robert Foreman. He married Mairi Fraser. He is an alumnus of the University of Georgia (A.B., 1921) and Columbia University (M.A., 1928; Ph.D., 1932). He also studied at Harvard University (1921-1922) and the London School of Economics (1923-1924).

From 1929 until 1933, Foreman was the director of studies for the Julius Rosenwald Fund, a financial trough for leftwingers. In 1934 and 1935, he was an adviser on the economic status of Negroes to Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, whose leftwing radicalism was conspicuous even in the Roosevelt Administration.

From 1935 until 1940, Foreman was director of the power division of the New Deal's Public Works Administration. From 1940 until 1942, he was director of defense housing for the New Deal's Federal Works Administration. Briefly, in 1943, he was in "civilian operational research" for the United States Navy, "giving advice, scientific advice to the Navy Department" on antisubmarine warfare. The work embraced "research with magnetic mines and other related matters," although Foreman had absolutely no training or experience in this line of work. (During his government service, Foreman became acquainted professionally and socially with Alger Hiss, described by Foreman as "a very great patriot . . . [and] a very fine civil servant.")

In 1943 and 1944, Foreman was an assistant professor of sociology at Black Mountain College. In 1944 and 1945, he was on the executive committee and secretary of Sidney Hillman's National Citizens Political Action Committee, the major Communist front of the period as it represented the Communist Party's supreme bid for political power during its twenty-five-year existence in the United States.

In 1948, Foreman was a board member and vice president of the Progressive Citizens of America, the launching platform for Henry A. Wallace's presidential campaign on the Progressive Party ticket. Foreman was treasurer of the Progressive Party, which "certainly ranks as one of the largest and most successful fronts ever created by the Communists."

In 1949, Foreman was acting director of the National Council on the Arts, Sciences and Professions, a Communist front which in that year sponsored the massive Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace "as a propaganda forum for Soviet foreign policy and Soviet 'culture.' " (In 1949, Foreman also attended a meeting of the Democratic Party of Poland. His travel expenses to and from Poland were paid by the Communist regime of Poland. In the 1930's, Foreman attended many receptions at the Soviet Union's Embassy in Washington, D.C.)

In 1950 and 1951, Foreman was director of the training program at Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research.

In 1956, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reported that Foreman "has no open affiliation with the Communist Party. He has frequently denied any such affiliations or connections." But by 1956, Foreman's affiliations had included the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); the American Slav Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Committee to Win the Peace ("subversive and Communist"); the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front" – "created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party"); and the Washington Committee for Democratic Action ("subversive and Communist").

In 1938, Foreman was a founder of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. From 1942 until 1948, he was the SCHW's president. In 1947, the House Committee on Un-American Activities described the SCHW as "a Communist-front organization 'which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South' although its 'professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.' " When the HCUA investigated the SCHW in 1947, it reported: "While the conference [SCHW] has succeeded in confusing certain elements in the North by its pretensions, representative southerners harbor no illusions as to its real character. The Democratic Women's Club of Alabama, an organization of long standing in the South, publicly demanded the disclosure of the names of the initiators of the conference, who provided the necessary finances and who appointed the delegates. They charged that the conference was of 'questionable origin and purpose' [*Birmingham News*, November 25, 1938].

"In their own inner circles the Communists were not nearly so reticent in claiming responsibility for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In his article in the *Communist* of January 1939, official monthly organ of the Communist Party, Robert Fowler Hall, then secretary of the Communist Party of Alabama, and speaker at the April 1940 session of the conference, reveals the moves behind the scenes. Referring to an earlier speech of Earl Browder, at that time general secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Hall wrote: 'Comrade Browder's remarks thus anticipated the

Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in Birmingham, November 20-23 . . . . Let us estimate the Southern Conference in the light of Comrade Browder's remarks at the tenth convention of the Communist Party [May 1938] . . . . In this sense, we can say that the Southern Conference was a brilliant confirmation of the line of the democratic front advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention . . . . Our comrades . . . naturally watched the conference preparations closely and helped wherever possible . . . . Southern State organizations of the Communist Party were represented at the conference by five southern Communist delegates. Our party contributed in a modest but constructive manner to the success of the conference . . . . In strengthening this movement, our party has before it a great task. On this basis, our party can and must proceed to recruit from the progressive ranks many hundreds of members.'

"In other words, the Communists were using the conference [SCHW] as a specific application of the so-called popular-front policy in the South. This line had been adopted by the Communist International at its seventh congress in Moscow in 1935 and was being applied by the Communist Parties throughout the world prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact."

In 1947, when the HCUA summarized the history of the SCHW (including the years of Foreman's presidency), it said: "The most conclusive proof of the Communist domination of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be found in the organization's strict and unvarying conformance to the line of the Communist Party in the field of foreign policy. It is also a clear indication of the fact that the real purpose of the organization was not 'human welfare' in the South, but rather to serve as a convenient vehicle in support of the current Communist Party line." (In 1949, the SCHW under that name went out of existence, and a new name was adopted – the Southern Conference Educational Fund; this had been the name of a subcommittee of the SCHW before the latter name was dropped.)

In 1951, Foreman was a founder of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee; he served as its director from 1951 until 1968. (In 1968, Foreman became director emeritus of the ECLC, and at about the same time, the name was changed to the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.)

The ECLC described its purpose as "to give uncompromising support for the Bill of Rights and the freedom of conscience and expression it guarantees." (In 1949, Foreman subscribed to the statement that "the defense of the civil liberties of Communists is the first line in the defense of liberties of all Americans because they are the group most oppressed.")

In 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported: "To defend the cases of Communist lawbreakers, fronts have been devised making special appeals in behalf of civil liberties and reaching out far beyond the confines of the Communist Party itself. Among these organizations are the . . . Emergency Civil Liberties Committee . . . . When the Communist Party itself is under fire these fronts offer a bulwark of protection."

In its 1958 *Annual Report,* the House Committee on Un-American Activities said: "The Emergency Civil Liberties Committee is an organization with headquarters in New York, whose avowed purpose is to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities and discredit the FBI. The Committee on Un-American Activities prepared a report on the organization in 1957 which described the activities of the ECLC and its campaign to cripple the antisubversive programs of Congress and Government agencies. The committee finds that the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, established in 1951, although representing itself as a non-Communist group, actually operates as a front for the Communist Party. It has repeatedly assisted, by means of funds and legal aid, Communists involved in Smith Act violations and similar legal proceedings. One of its chief activities has been and still is the dissemination of voluminous Communist propaganda material.

"Frank Wilkinson was called as a witness when he appeared in Atlanta as a representative of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee to propagandize against the Committee on Un-American Activities and to protest its hearings. In 1956 Wilkinson was identified as a Communist Party member by a former FBI undercover agent within the party. Summoned at that time to answer the allegation, his reply to all questions was, 'I am answering no questions of this committee.' This also became his stock reply to questions when he appeared during the Atlanta hearings. He absolutely refused to discuss his official connection with the ECLC, his past role as executive secretary of the ECLC adjunct, the Citizens' Committee To Preserve American Freedoms, or whether he was a member of the Communist Party. Wilkinson has since been convicted of contempt of Congress and sentenced to one year in jail.

"Disputing the non-Communist claim of the organization, the committee finds that a number of other individuals connected with the ECLC also have been identified under oath as Communists. Among those are: Harvey O'Connor, chairman of the ECLC; Corliss Lamont, vice chairman, who was identified by four former Communists during hearings held by the Subversive Activities Control Board on the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; Russ Nixon, a member of the executive board of the National Council of the ECLC; Muriel Gravelle McAvoy, formerly employed as a secretary; Dorothy W. Douglas; Benjamin Dreyfus; Victor Rabinowitz (identified before a Senate investigating committee); Carey McWilliams; Anne Braden, and David Rein. The six last named are members of the National Council of the ECLC. A substantial number of those listed on a recent letterhead of the ECLC have lengthy Communist front records."

Before Foreman gave up his active directorship of the ECLC, he launched his campaign on behalf of draft evaders. As described in [N]ECLC literature: "NECLC was one of the earliest defenders of moral and philosophical objectors to the war. It now [1969] has a long docket of these cases, as well as cases of men who became objectors while in service. It is challenging the Selective Service Law because it violates the freedom of religion clause of the First Amendment; it discriminates against the economically deprived of our society; it deprives young men of their liberty and possibly of their lives without the due process of law; and it subjects registrants to an arbitrary selective service system without right of appeal." The [N]ECLC has also concerned itself with the defense of the Black Panthers, anti-war demonstrators, and street rioters. It has challenged the legality and constitutionality of New York's criminal anarchy statute and the legality and constitutionality of the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations.

Some of the more prominent left-wingers who have worked with Foreman in the [N]ECLC include: Leonard Boudin, Donna Allen, Stringfellow Barr, Edward U. Condon, Ossie Davis, David Dellinger, Maxwell Geismar, Robert Kenny, William Kunstler, Isidor F. Stone, and Paul Sweezy.

CHARLES FRANKEL was born on December 13, 1917 in New York City, son of Estelle Cohen and Abraham Frankel. He married Helen Lehman. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1937; Ph.D., 1946). He also pursued graduate studies at Cornell University (1937-1938). He is the author of *The Faith of Reason* (1948); *The Bear and the Beaver* (1951); *The Case for Modern Man* (1956); *The Democratic Prospect* (1962); *The Love of Anxiety and Other Essays* (1965); *The Neglected Aspect of Foreign Affairs* (1966); *Education and the Barricades* (1968); and *High on Foggy Bottom* (1969). He is the principal author of *The Power of the Democratic Idea* (1960), a Rockefeller Brothers panel report on American Democracy. He is the editor of *Introduction to Contemporary Civilization in the West* (1941); Rousseau's *The Social Contract* (1947); *Uses of Philosophy* (1955); *Issues in University Education* (1959); and *The Golden Age of American Philosophy* (1960). Since 1968, he has been an editor-at-large for *Saturday Review.*

In 1939, Frankel joined the faculty at Columbia University. Since 1956, he has been a professor of philosophy. He has been a visiting lecturer or visiting professor at the University of Dublin, the New York School of Social Work, Bennington College, Ohio University, Bowdoin College, and the University of Paris. He has been a Guggenheim fellow, a Fulbright professor, and a Carnegie Corporation fellow.

From 1965 until 1967, Frankel was in the Department of State as an assistant secretary of state for educational and cultural affairs. In 1966, he was chairman of the United States delegation to the general conference of UNESCO. (While holding his post in the Department of State, Frankel addressed a conference on higher education, sponsored by the California Teachers Association. William McPhillips of the *Los Angeles Times* reported on the speech [May 7, 1966]: "A radical answer to the nationwide student unrest that culminated in the 1964 riots at Berkeley was suggested here Friday by Charles Frankel, assistant U.S. secretary of state for educational and cultural affairs. 'Perhaps we should abolish classes. Let the students spend four years on campus in an intellectual atmosphere, hearing the lectures they wish. Why this lockstep approach to education? A common plea by students is that they want to be treated as mature adults. Let's treat them so – but test them periodically to show them the important difference between opinion and knowledge.' " As part of Frankel's rationale for his suggested reform, McPhillips quoted him as saying: "We have Vietnam for breakfast, Europe for lunch. The task of training one to live in such a complex world is an enormous one.")

As a philosopher, Frankel went to the defense of civil rights demonstrators by way of a tortuous reasoning process in the *New York Times Magazine* (January 12, 1964): "It is true, of course, that one swallow does not make a summer, and that the test of legal democratic processes is not this or that particular success or failure, but rather the general direction in which these processes move over the long run. Still, the position that violation of the law is never justifiable so long as there are legal alternatives overstates this important truth. It fails to face at least three important exceptions to it.

"In the first place, dramatic disobedience to the law by a minority may be the only effective way of catching the attention of or winning the support of the majority. Most classic cases of civil disobedience exemplify this truth, from the early Christians to Gandhi and his supporters. Civil disobedience, like almost no other technique, can shame a majority and make it ask itself just how far it is willing to go, just how seriously it really is committed to defending the status quo.

"Second, there is the simple but painful factor of time. If a man is holding you down on a bed of nails, it is all very well for a bystander to say that you live in a great country in which there are legal remedies for your condition, and that you ought, therefore, to be patient and wait for those remedies to take effect. But your willingness to listen to this counsel will depend, quite properly, on the nature of the injury you are suffering.

"Third, it is baseless prejudice to assume that observance of the law is always conducive to strengthening a democratic system while disobedience to the law can never have a salutary effect. A majority's complacent acquiescence in bad laws can undermine the faith of a minority in the power of democratic methods to rectify manifest evils; yet a vigorous democracy depends on the existence of minorities holding just such a faith.

"Disobedience to bad laws can sometimes jolt democratic processes into motion. Which strengthens one's hopes for democracy more – the behavior of the Negroes in Birmingham who broke municipal ordinances when they staged their protest marches, or the behavior of the police, using dogs and fire hoses to assert their legal authority?

"Another factor should also be taken into account. In our Federal system, there are often legitimate doubts concerning the legal validity, under our Constitution, of various state or local ordinances. Disobedience to these laws is in many cases simply a practical, though painful way of testing their legality. But even where no thought of such a test is involved, there is often present a moral issue which no one can easily dodge – least of all the men whose personal dignity and self-respect are caught up in the issue."

Frankel has been an official of the New York Civil Liberties Union. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

GEORGE S. FRANKLIN was born on March 23, 1913 in New York City, son of Elizabeth Jennings and George Franklin. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1936) and Yale University (LL.B., 1939).

In 1939, Franklin worked as a law clerk. In 1940, he was an assistant to Nelson Rockefeller, then the Coordinator for Inter-American Affairs, an independent federal agency created by President Franklin Roosevelt and his alter ego, Harry Hopkins. From 1941 until 1944, Franklin was with the Department of State in the division of world trade intelligence.

Since 1945, Franklin has been with the Council on Foreign Relations, as staff associate (1945-1951); assistant executive director (1951-1953); and since 1953, executive director. The Council on Foreign Relations, before and during Franklin's directorship, has been the most influential organization in the ruling liberal establishment, which virtually directs all facets of United States foreign policy.

Franklin has further entrenched himself in the hierarchy of the liberals by serving on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda, and as secretary of the leftwing-internationalist Atlantic Council of the United States.

H. BRUCE FRANKLIN was born on February 28, 1934 in Brooklyn, son of Florence Cohen and Robert Franklin. He married Jane Morgan. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (B.A., 1955) and Stanford University (Ph.D., 1961). He is the author of *The Wake of the Gods: Melville's Mythology* (1963); and *Future Perfect: American Science Fiction of the Nineteenth Century* (1966). He is the editor of Melville's *The Confidence Man* (1967) and Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter and Other Writings* (1967).

From 1961 until 1964, Franklin was an assistant professor of English and American literature at Stanford University. In 1964 and 1965, he was an assistant professor of English and American literature at Johns Hopkins University. Since 1965, he has been an associate professor at Stanford University. He has been a technical writing consultant at the Stanford Research Institute.

Franklin is a Socialist. He has been a member of the ultra-radical racist Congress of Racial Equality and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He has been a member of the leftist-pacifist Stanford Committee for Peace in Vietnam. In 1966, he sponsored the Statewide Conference on Power and Politics, which was a major project of the entire New Left community of California.

In the 1970 Report of the California Senate's Fact-finding Subcommittee on Un-American Activities, under the heading "The Revolutionary Union," the Subcommittee reported: "After the appearance of an article by Ed Montgomery in the March 23, 1967 issue of *The San Francisco Examiner,* we were deluged with inquiries from gravely concerned citizens. Montgomery's article described a situation that developed from Maoist study groups in and around Palo Alto. Originally known as the Red Guards, the same name subsequently adopted by the Chinese Communist group discussed previously, the name was changed to the Revolutionary Union, and the central office moved from Palo Alto to Grant Avenue in San Francisco. Its declared goal was formation of a coalition of the most radical revolutionary groups dedicated to the violent overthrow of our government. The all-out date for an armed uprising was set for 1973.

"The Montgomery article, based on interviews with persons who had attended some of the study sessions, asserted that the organization planned an assassination of political leaders, advised soldiers to murder their officers, counselled the killing of policemen and their families, the release of all prisoners from penal institutions, the deliberate provoking of confrontations against law enforcement agencies, and a widespread camapaign of terror. The article specifically mentioned H. Bruce Franklin, associate professor of English at Stanford, as a source of information and an outspoken advocate for the takeover of Stanford and the University of California."

DONALD FRASER was born on February 20, 1924 in Minneapolis, son of Lois MacKay and Everett Fraser. He married Arvonne Skelton. He is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota (B.A., 1944; LL.B., 1948).

In 1947, Fraser was engaged in activities for the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party. From 1948 until 1962, he practiced law in Minneapolis. From 1955 until 1962, he was a member of Minnesota's Senate and was secretary of the Senate's Liberal Caucus. In 1960, he was chairman of Minnesota Citizens for John F. Kennedy and, in the same year, secretary of Minnesota's delegation to the Democratic National Convention. Since 1963, he has been a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. (In his 1964 campaign, he received support from the leftist-pacifist Council for a Livable World.) In 1964, he was a member of the platform committee at the Democratic National Convention. In 1968, he was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. He has also been on the national board of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action.

In the Congress, Fraser has been a persistent radical on matters of domestic and foreign policies. He was a stalwart supporter of any and all New Frontier and Great Society legislation on housing, jobs, food, education, gun control, arts, and civil rights. His basic outlook toward employment has been that the federal government should "guarantee work throughout life to every person who wants it." He has been a breast-beater and hand-wringer on civil rights: "Our public guilt has been thrust upon us; we wear it uncomfortably, and would like to shed it." The Office of Economic Opportunity has had no stronger supporter than Fraser. He was highly enthusiastic over Ralph Abernathy's so-called Poor People's March, and the various civil rights acts of recent years, no matter how liberal, have never been comprehensive enough to satisfy his patronizing attitude toward civil rights agitators.

On taxation, Fraser has been somewhat erratic: at times, he has urged an increase of taxes to soak the rich; at other times, he has urged a lowering of taxes to soak the rich.

Fraser has worked for federal gun registration and for lowering of the voting age to eighteen. He joined left-wing Democrats supporting the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Bill "to give us a clear picture of how well we are doing in our efforts to provide a decent life and full opportunity for all Americans." The sponsors of the Bill wanted to establish a Council of Social Advisers to "advise the President in the establishment of social [i.e., Socialist] policies." The Bill would require the President to give annual reports to the Congress "on the state of the Nation's social health."

In domestic matters, Fraser's biggest interest seems to have been the federal subsidization of the arts, so that we can "enrich the common life." He has introduced a bill, the National Foundation for the Social Sciences Bill of 1960, whereby the federal government would underwrite, fund, and support research in political science, economics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, law, social statistics, demography, geography, linguistics, communications, international relations, and various areas of education. As part of his justification for this boondoggle, Fraser has said: "We who are splitting the atom and studying the far corners of the universe must at the same time learn why our cities burn every summer and why our children prefer cap guns to marbles."

Fraser's posture on foreign policy was outlined in the first major foreign speech he made in the Congress when he enumerated what he alleged were U.S. foreign policy successes after World War II. He mentioned that western Europe had unparalleled prosperity; that the Middle East was more stable; that Africa had several dozen new nations which, for the most part, had not been enticed by Communism; that the Alliance for Progress had been a great success; that India and Pakistan were making great progress; and that the Far East had achieved relative stability and calmness (he failed to make mention of Red China). In 1963, Fraser viewed Southeast Asia as "the major battleground" against "Communist forces" and he supported the New Frontier's struggle against "aggression" in Vietnam.

Fraser's attitude toward the Vietnam War has followed the zig-zag of the liberal line. When he entered the Congress, he applauded American efforts to repel Communist aggression. By 1965, he felt that the Vietnam War should become the province of the United Nations: "What has been established since the United Nations has been in business is that they will recognize overt aggression and will act to meet such aggression." In 1966, he offered the incredible assumption that members of the Viet Cong and National Liberation Front do not "regard themselves simply as soldiers whose command loyalties run to Hanoi." Rather, said Fraser, the NLF and Viet Cong are quite independent and are more or less allies of Hanoi. In 1967, he was calling for a halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam and for recognition by the United States that the NLF – not North Vietnam – was the principal belligerent in the war. By 1968, Fraser was in the forefront of those who were crying for a political settlement for the Vietnam War; he had great faith that Averell Harriman, the perennial failure, would accomplish a great deal at the so-called Paris Peace Talks, which have lumbered on long after Harriman conducted his usual futile performance. And once the Nixon Administration came into power, Fraser became one of the shrillest doves in the Congress.

The United Nations, according to the unimaginative Fraser, is the "best hope for achieving a world of peace with freedom under law." He has long had a blind faith in the United Nations and in the concept of World Peace through World Law. He has long favored a UN peacekeeping force: "The force could be thought of as a sort of international fire department, prepared to extinguish brush fires before they flare into major conflagrations." On a steering committee, which includes leftwing Senators Jacob Javits and Frank Church and Representative James Fulton, Fraser has helped to guide Members of Congress for World Peace through Rule of Law.

On disarmament, Fraser has offered the liberals' favorite cant against the spectre of world holocaust. Test-ban and nonproliferation treaties have been given his complete endorsement. When perpetuation of the defensive anti-ballistic missile system was in debate, he seemed undecided as to whether it should be condemned as too ineffective, too dangerous, or too expensive. Therefore, he argued against the system on all three grounds, but mainly on the basis of the danger that the ABM system "would inevitably lead to a heightened arms race between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

Foreign aid bills have always received Fraser's blessing. He has found that, "basically, most Americans are in favor of foreign aid" – a discovery he made while studying polls. When arguing for foreign aid measures, he relies upon standard liberal clichés: "The world is changing every day" – "We cannot live and survive alone in a hostile world." In his very first session in Congress, while speaking for a foreign aid bill, Fraser set the pattern for his subsequent stance on handouts, using one of the favorite arguments of the liberals that such handouts are really anti-Communist weapons: "I believe that this [foreign aid] program and the Peace Corps and related programs provide the only tools by which the Executive can seek to influence and shape events abroad. It would be tragic for us to abandon this effort and thus default to the Communist efforts to spread their system throughout the world." (Fraser's anti-Communist excuses for foreign aid collapse in light of his opposition to three anti-Communist regimes. He has supported U.S. sanctions against the anti-Communist government of Rhodesia. He has opposed the anti-Communist regime in Greece: "We should no longer continue to give any military aid to Greece until she has returned to some reasonable or legitimate form of parliamentary democracy." He was a congressional leader behind the drive to have the United Nations assume direct responsibility for the administration of South-West Africa – an action that could only be construed as unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of South Africa's anti-Communist government.)

Fraser, before and during his years in Congress, has probably been most notable for his internationalism. He has been a long-standing member of Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union, two leftwing, globalist organizations. He has boasted of his two decades of support for Atlantic Union, because it "would be a move toward regulating the international affairs of mankind by substituting the rule of law for traditional diplomacy." Without offering a shadow of proof, Fraser has stated: "The overwhelming power of the United States is a cause of concern to some in Europe. They question the wisdom with which this power has been used." To remedy the situation, Fraser believes that the United States should forsake "nationalism," which, though not peculiarly an American vice, is the key to the world's ills. But he anticipates a giant step toward world peace when the United States overcomes its nationalism by joining in a federation of nations, beginning with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization group.

HARROP FREEMAN was born on November 7, 1907 in Elyria, Ohio, son of Lena Goodman and Glenn Freeman. He married Ruth St. John. He is an alumnus of Cornell University (A.B., 1929; LL.B., 1930). He is the author of *Peace Is the Victory* (1944); *Road to Peace* (1946); *Federal Tax Handbook* (1959); *Tax Practice Deskbook* (1960); *Dear Mr. President: An Open Letter on Foreign*

Policy (1961); *Legal Interviewing and Counseling* (1964); and *Counseling: A Bibliography* (1964).

From 1930 until 1941, Freeman practiced law in Niagara Falls, New York. Since 1941, he has practiced law in Ithaca, New York, and in Philadelphia. From 1941 until 1950, he was executive director of the Pacifist Research Bureau in Philadelphia and a representative of the Society of Friends' Committee on National Legislation. From 1942 until 1945, he was a law professor at the College of William and Mary. Since 1945, he has been a law professor at Cornell University.

Freeman has been on the executive committee of the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation. He has been a member of the War Resisters League, a group of conscientious objectors, who describe themselves as anarchists, democratic socialists, and independent radicals. They agitate for unilateral disarmament, for U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China, and on behalf of the Black Panthers. The WRL is affiliated with War Resisters International, which has always been saturated with Communists and Socialists.

Freeman has been a fellow of the ultra-radical Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, where he was concerned with revising the United Nations Charter and the Constitution of the United States. In politics, he has been a Republican but has converted to Democratic-liberal. In 1962, he ran on the Liberal Party ticket for Congress from New York, supported by the National Committee of 1,000 to Elect Peace Candidates. On the Committee were such notable radicals as W.H. "Ping" Ferry, Lucy Montgomery, Linus Pauling, Clarence Pickett, and Albert Szent-Györgyi.

FRED W. FRIENDLY was born on October 30, 1915 in New York City, son of Therese Friendly and Samuel Wachenheimer. He was married to and divorced from Dorothy Greene. He is married to Ruth Mark. He attended Providence Business College.

From 1937 until 1941, Friendly was a radio producer, writer, and narrator in Providence, Rhode Island. From 1941 until 1945, he was in the European China-Burma-India Theaters with the U.S. Army's Information and Education program. (He served as a correspondent for the Army's *CBI Roundup,* the Asian equivalent of *Stars and Stripes.*)

In 1947, Friendly met the leftwing radio commentator, Edward R. Murrow, and the two began a partnership in broadcasting that lasted until Murrow became the director of the United States Information Agency in 1961. In 1949, Friendly and Murrow produced a commercially successful record album, *I Can Hear It Now* – an aural history of events in the period 1932-1945. Two subsequent albums covered the 1920's and the post-World War II period. Each album was contrived to present leftist-liberal personalities and the current leftist-liberal line in a favorable light.

Friendly and Murrow expanded the concept of their aural history record albums into a radio series, *Hear It Now,* broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System. The partnership continued into the field of television where, for seven years, the two collaborated on the CBS-TV series, *See It Now.*

On *See It Now,* Friendly and Murrow provided a propaganda forum for Red China's Chou En-lai, for Red Yugoslavia's Tito, for security risk J. Robert Oppenheimer, for UNICEF. They used *See It Now* to crusade for the American Civil Liberties Union, for the recognition of Red China, and for Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

Among liberal-leftists, the most widely heralded *See It Now* program was an attack upon the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy and his efforts to expose Communists in government. Friendly and Murrow relied in great part upon an alleged improper identification by McCarthy of Annie Lee Moss as a Communist. Eventually, it was proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that Annie Lee Moss, an employee of the Department of the Army, was in fact a member of the Communist Party. Nevertheless, when Friendly wrote his *Due To Circumstances Beyond Our Control* in 1967, he repeated the nonsense about Annie Lee Moss that he and Murrow had used thirteen years earlier. (In 1967, Alfred A. Knopf published *In Search of Light: The Broadcasts of Edward R. Murrow, 1938-1961,* edited by Edward Bliss Jr. The spurious saga of Annie Lee Moss was included, with no apologies to the memory of maligned Senator McCarthy.)

The Friendly-Murrow team also collaborated on *CBS Reports,* with Friendly as executive producer and Murrow as commentator. The program glorified such leftist stalwarts as Walter Lippmann, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Carl Sandburg; it fought against the American Medical Association; it propagandized for federal gun legislation; and, in general, it took a highly prejudicial leftist stance on every topic that served as a theme for the series. The most controversial of all *CBS Reports* during the Friendly-Murrow years was probably "Harvest of Shame," a flagrantly distorted presentation of the conditions of migrant farm workers in the South.

In 1965 and 1966, Friendly was president of *CBS News.* As might be expected, whenever a news item was subject to a leftist interpretation, the programs were thinly disguised leftwing editorials. In 1966, after more than fifteen years with CBS, Friendly resigned his $70,000-a-year position during an internecine quarrel with other officials. Friendly became exceedingly disturbed when CBS did not televise a hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when ultra-leftist George F. Kennan was testifying against United States participation in the Vietnam War. (Friendly's efforts to promote leftism had not gone unnoticed. His *See It Now* and *CBS Reports* series received dozens of awards. For his own part in these broadcasts Friendly received ten George Foster Peabody Awards, which are leftist status symbols.)

Two months after Friendly left CBS, he became the first Edward R. Murrow Professor of Broadcast Journalism at Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism. At the same time, he became a radio and television consultant for the Ford Foundation.

LAWRENCE H. FUCHS was born on January 29, 1927 in New York City, son of Frances Scheiber and Alfred Fuchs. He married Natalie Rogers. He is an alumnus of New York University (B.A., 1950) and Harvard University (Ph.D., 1955). He is the author of *The Political Behavior of American Jews* (1955); *Hawaii Pono: A Social History* (1961); *John F. Kennedy and American Catholicism* (1967); *Those Peculiar Americans: The Peace Corps and American National Character* (1967); and *American Ethnic Politics* (1968).

From 1950 until 1952, Fuchs was a teaching fellow at Harvard University. Since 1952, he has been at Brandeis University: as instructor of political science (1952-1955); assistant professor

(1955-1957); associate professor (1957-1959); dean of the faculty (1959-1961); and since 1963, professor of American civilization and politics. From 1951 until 1959, he was a part-time radio/television news commentator for WCRB and WGBH in Boston. In 1958 and 1959, he was recipient of a senior grant in American governmental processes from the leftist-oriented Social Science Research Council. On leave of absence from Brandeis from 1961 until 1963, he was director of the United States Peace Corps in the Philippines. In 1964, he was a visiting fellow at the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute. In 1965 and 1966, he was a senior specialist at the University of Hawaii's East-West Center.

Fuchs has served on the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been affiliated with such ultra-radical racist organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Congress of Racial Equality. He has been affiliated with the Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union, a branch of the ACLU, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness.

RICHARD N. GARDNER was born on July 9, 1927 in New York City, son of Ethel Elias and Samuel Gardner. He married Danielle Luzzatto. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1948); Yale University (LL.B., 1951); and Oxford University (Ph.D., 1954), where he was a Rhodes scholar (1951-1953). He is the author of *Sterling-Dollar Diplomacy* (1956); *New Directions in U.S. Foreign Economic Policy* (1959); *In Pursuit of World Order* (1964); and *Blueprint for Peace* (1966). He is co-author, with Max Milliken, of *The Global Partnership: International Agencies and Economic Development* (1968).

In 1953 and 1954, Gardner was a teaching fellow of international legal studies at Harvard University's Law School. From 1954 until 1957, he practiced law in New York City. Except for interruptions for public service, he has been at Columbia University since 1957: associate professor of law (1957-1960); professor of law (1960-1961; 1965-1966); and professor of law and international relations since 1966. He has been a visiting professor at the University of Istanbul (1958) and the University of Rome (1967-1968).

In 1961, two leftwing stalwarts, Adlai Stevenson and Harlan Cleveland, recruited Gardner into the Department of State as an assistant secretary of state for international organizations. From 1962 until 1965, he was a deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. In 1964, he was the U.S. alternate delegate to the 19th General Assembly of the UN. In 1965, he was senior adviser to the U.S. Ambassador to the UN, Adlai Stevenson. In 1965 and 1966, he was senior adviser to the U.S. delegation to the 20th and 21st General Assemblies of the UN.

Few Americans have done more propaganda work on behalf of the United Nations than Gardner. He is a full-time leftwing internationalist. He is in complete favor of negotiations with the Soviet Union and Red China to achieve general and complete disarmament. He favors "an effective standby military capacity" for the UN "to deal with peacekeeping emergencies" because it is "essential to reduce the risks of violence while we live in the shadow of the arms race." He favors wide-open trade relations between the United States and the Communist bloc. He favors "curbing population growth" through the efforts of the United States and the United Nations. (He is a director of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.) He favors cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in space exploration. He favors wider cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States. (" . . . The United States could offer Soviet leaders the opportunity to address Americans regularly on television, in return for the same privilege to us in the Soviet Union. We could propose to exchange time on the Voice of America for the same amount of time on Radio Moscow.") He favors U.S. ratification of the fraudulent UN conventions on Human Rights, Slavery, Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Genocide.

Gardner is a director of the leftwing-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States. He is a director of Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism. He is a member of the Council of Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a director of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda.

LLOYD K. GARRISON was born on November 19, 1897 in New York City, son of Alice Kirkham and Lloyd Garrison. He married Ellen Jay. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1919; LL.B., 1922).

From 1923 until 1932, Garrison practiced law in New York City. From 1932 until 1945, he was on the University of Wisconsin's faculty as a professor of law and dean of the University's law school. In 1934, he became prominent in Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal program as organizer of the National Labor Relations Board.

From 1942 until 1945, Garrison was with the National War Labor Board: as general counsel and executive director (1942-1943); public member (1944); and chairman (1945). In 1946, he resumed his private law practice.

Garrison became well known in the labor relations field. In 1948, he was on the board of directors of the National Academy of Arbitrators. Since 1947, he has been director of the American Arbitration Association. From 1946 until 1948, he was on the labor advisory committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. In 1948 and 1949, he was on the legal advisory committee of the National Security Resources Board. Since 1936, he has often served as a referee for the National Railroad Adjustment Board. Since 1940, he has been a member of the arbitration board under agreement between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council. He has served in a similar capacity under agreement with the American Newspaper Publishers Association and the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants Union.

Garrison has been a member of New York City's board of education since 1961, and from 1965 until 1967, he was president of the board. From 1951 until 1957, he was a member of the New York State Democratic Committee, and since 1951, a member of the New York County Democratic Committee. He is on the board of directors of the Field Foundation, which has been quite generous in grants to leftwingers and their causes. He is a trustee of the Institute for Advanced Study, which since its inception has been a haven for leftwing academicians, including J. Robert Oppenheimer, Albert Einstein, and George F. Kennan.

Garrison has been a member and official of the National Urban League since 1926: treasurer (1926-1932); president (1947-1952); and director from 1947 to the present. (In recent years, the NUL has become overtly involved with racist agitators.) From 1937 until 1967, he was vice chairman of the national committee of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead of Negro agitation for the last half century. Since 1965, he has been on the executive committee of the leftist National Lawyers Committee on Civil Rights. In earlier years, he was affiliated with the International Juridical Association (an organization which "actively defended Communists and consistently followed the Communist Party line"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); the Wisconsin Conference on Social Legislation ("subversive and Communist"); and the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist").

When Garrison received the first annual Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award, the *New York Times* described him as a "practicing idealist."

CHARLES R. GARRY was born on March 17, 1909 in Bridgewater, Massachusetts. He married Louise Edgar. He studied at the San Francisco Law School and was admitted to the California bar in 1938. (In the mid-1930's, he adopted Socialism as his ideology and even contemplated joining the Communist-controlled Lincoln Brigade in the Spanish Civil War: "We had the struggle going on in Spain and I wanted to go and become a volunteer to fight. But I decided to stay in law school.") Garry became rather well-known for his legal work on behalf of Communist-dominated trade unions and, by the mid-1960's, his trial work was worth as much as $200,000 annually to his law firm. (One of Garry's earliest claims to notoriety arose in 1940, when he prepared a legal brief in opposition to a proposed outlawing of the Communist Party in California.)

In June 1957 at hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Dr. Jack Patten and Mrs. Dorothy M. Jeffers identified Garry as a member of the lawyers' cell (known as the Haymarket Club) of the Professional Section of the Communist Party in the San Francisco area. Two days after the Patten-Jeffers identification, Garry was given an opportunity by the HCUA to affirm or deny his affiliations with the Communist Party. He proved to be a hostile and argumentative witness, and in response to all questions concerning his direct or indirect relations with the Communist Party, he invoked the Fifth and First Amendments. (Beyond the scope of sworn testimony, Garry has denied his membership in the Communist Party. For example: "I don't belong to any organized Marxist Party. I adhere towards the means of production to be in the hands of the people. I don't believe that the 76 corporate bodies, corporations in the United States should be running this country." Wallace Turner in the *New York Times,* December 16, 1969.)

A large segment of Garry's career was

summarized in a report of the HCUA ("Communist Legal Subversion: The Role of the Communist Lawyer," February 16, 1959): "Communist-run organizations and campaigns in the Northern California area have been able to rely on Mr. Garry both for legal services and for leadership roles.

"The subversive Civil Rights Congress retained Mr. Garry in 1949 and 1952 to represent a number of defendants involved in legal proceedings in San Francisco. In 1949, he also served as spokesman for a delegation – organized by the Civil Rights Congress – which appeared before a local United States attorney to protest contempt sentences meted out to various identified Communists in Los Angeles for failing to answer Federal grand jury questions. He was featured as a speaker at local Civil Rights Congress propaganda rallies, such as an October 1949 mass meeting in San Francisco which raised $5,000 for a bail fund for Communist Party defendants in legal proceedings, and an October 1953 mass meeting exploiting the Wesley Wells case. His name appeared on the San Francisco Civil Rights Congress petition to halt deportation proceedings against identified Communist aliens John Santo, Michael Obermeier, Alex Bittelman and Claudia Jones.

"A member of the National Lawyers Guild since he was admitted to the bar in 1938, Mr. Garry represented the San Francisco chapter of the guild in submitting a brief against a local Communist registration ordinance in 1950. In that year, he was listed as a member of the executive board of the San Francisco chapter. Mr. Garry served as president of the chapter from 1951 through 1954. As chapter president, he signed a National Lawyers Guild friend of the court brief in 1954 in behalf of Mrs. Edith Brooks, who had been denied admission to the bar of California after refusing to tell a bar examining committee whether or not she had ever been a member of the Communist Party.

"Mr. Garry was a delegate from the Bay area to the guild's national convention in 1954. At the 1956 national convention, he appeared as a panel speaker and was elected by the convention to the guild's national executive board. He was re-elected to the executive board at the 1957 national convention, where he also served as chairman of the nominating committee.

"In 1948, as a candidate of the Independent Progressive Party, Mr. Garry unsuccessfully sought election to the United States House of Representatives from California's Fifth Congressional District. He again attempted to gain a House seat with the same Communist-controlled political backing in a special election held in 1949.

"As a political candidate in 1948, Mr. Garry announced his opposition to the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill, the provisions of which became part of the Internal Security Act of 1950. At a series of public meetings during the same year, he was billed as a speaker against this so-called 'police state' legislation and on one occasion personally joined a delegation to the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urging a board resolution to Congress against the bill. In his 1949 campaign for Congress, Mr. Garry's speeches continued to emphasize his opposition to official action against the Communist conspiracy. Typical was his radio speech in October 1949 in which he branded the Taft-Hartley Act, loyalty checks, deportations, and the Smith Act trial of 11 national Communist Party leaders in New York as 'part of the curtain of fear being drawn about our liberties.'

"In 1951, Charles Garry was publicized as being one of the signers of a number of statements protesting the United States Supreme Court's action in upholding the conviction of top Communist Party leaders under the Smith Act; the statements called for outright appeal of the anti-Communist legislation. Mr. Garry in 1953 was one of the signers of a motion asking the United States Supreme Court for permission to file a brief for a rehearing for Baltimore, Md., Communist Party leaders convicted under the Smith Act.

"Other Communist fronts in which Mr. Garry played a leading role include the California Labor School and the International Workers Order, which scheduled him as featured speaker. The IWO has been cited as one of the most effective and closely knit organizations among Communist-front movements. Mr. Garry has also acted as an official sponsor and meeting chairman for the San Francisco Committee To Save the Rosenbergs."

The 1959 Report of the California Senate's Un-American Activities Committee stated that Garry served as an attorney for the International Labor Defense. (The Committee was told by a former Communist that the ILD was a branch of the Communist Party and "that all persons who worked in confidential capacities in or for that organization were required to be members of the Communist Party or completely subservient to its discipline." Garry accompanied many clients to hearings conducted by the California Senate's Un-American Activities Committee. Invariably, the clients invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about their Communist Party affiliations.)

In 1967, Garry began a career as chief counsel for the Black Panthers. Since that time, his clients have included Huey Newton, Eldridge Cleaver, David Hilliard, and Bobby Seale. (In 1969, Garry was supposed to be Seale's attorney at the Chicago trial of The Conspiracy. Illness, however, interrupted Garry's work and as a result of this and other complications Seale's part in the trial was postponed.)

Garry was asked by *New York Times* correspondent Wallace Turner whether he was a Black Panther. Garry replied: "Oh no, and they will never make me one because the Black Panther party is only for black people. But they consider me a Panther because of the way I feel. I think the Black Panther party today, as limited as it is in its membership and being persecuted as it is, represents what I consider will save America from its own seeds of destruction."

On August 10, 1970, in an address to the National Student Association's Twenty-third Congress, Garry said that "fascism is on its way" in the United States and advised that different factions of the Left should "organize and get together to fight repression." Before Garry left the podium, he castigated the nation's judicial system (a defendant could appear before a federal judge who is "a political hack, part of the Establishment, an alcoholic, or senile," he said); the method of selecting judges (he offered no alternative); lawyers, in general ("The American lawyers today have completely fallen down in their responsibilities, their duties." A lawyer's job today should be to keep his clients out of jail a few days a year so they can "do their things and make the changes that are necessary"); and the appellate system ("The appeals courts today may give you justice, provided you have the money to get there and the patience to stay there").

WILMER ST. JOHN GARWOOD was born on December 15, 1896 in Bastrop, Texas, son of Hettie Page and Hiram Garwood. He married Ellen Clayton. He is an alumnus of Georgetown University (A.B., 1917) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1922).

In 1922 and 1923, he was with the legal department of the Texas Company in New York City. From 1924 until 1928 and from 1934 until 1947, he practiced law in Houston. From 1929 until 1933, he was counsel in Buenos Aires for Standard Oil of New Jersey. From 1948 until 1958, he was an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Texas. Since 1958, his law practice has been located in Austin. In 1961, he was a professor of law at the University of Texas.

Since at least 1960, Garwood has been active in Clarence Streit's complex of leftwing-internationalist groups: Federal Union, the International Movement for Atlantic Union, and the Atlantic Union Committee. He has been national director of the internationalist English Speaking Union of the United States. Since 1966, he has been a member of the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda.

MAXWELL GEISMAR was born on August 1, 1909 in New York City, son of Mary Feinberg and Leon Geismar. He married Anne Rosenberg. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (B.A., 1931; M.A., 1932). He is the author of *Writers in Crisis* (1942), *The Last of the Provincials* (1947), *Rebels and Ancestors* (1952), *American Moderns* (1958), and *Henry James and the Jacobites* (1964).

In 1932 and 1933, Geismar was a teaching fellow at Harvard University. From 1933 until 1944, he taught literature at Sarah Lawrence College. (In 1943 and 1944, he held a Guggenheim fellowship.) From 1945 until 1950, he was a contributing editor of the leftwing *Nation* magazine. He has been a contributor to the *New York Times Book Review*, the *New York Herald Tribune Books*, *American Scholar*, *Saturday Review*, *Yale Review*, *Virginia Quarterly*, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, *Compton's Encyclopedia*, and *Atlantic*. In 1964, when the ultra-leftwing published the first issue of *American Dialog* (which was advertised in the Communists' *Worker*), Geismar appeared as a contributor along with such stalwart leftists as Dorothy Day, John Howard Lawson, Leroi Jones, and Manachem S. Arnoni. (In 1965, Geismar was a financial contributor to Arnoni's pro-Communist magazine, *Minority of One.*) In 1966, Geismar was a senior editor of *Ramparts*, an iconoclastic, ultra-leftwing magazine.

Geismar has been affiliated with the Socialist Workers Party ("subversive and Communist"); the Welcoming Committee for Kaoru Yasui, a Japanese Communist leader; the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell ("Communist campaign"); the Committee for a Democratic Spain and the Emergency Committee for Disaster Relief to Cuba, both of which were dominated by Communists and fellow travelers; Defenders of 3 against HUAC (these were three fellow travelers who were in contempt of Congress); Bertrand Russell's "international war crimes tribunal," which was an international Communist project; the Monroe Defense Committee, on behalf of the pro-Communist racial agitator and fugitive from justice, Robert Williams; the Alexander Defense Committee, on behalf of leftwing racial agitators in South Africa; the Charter Group for a

Pledge of Conscience, seeking a "fair" trial for six who had conspired to murder a woman shop keeper in Harlem; the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam and the Writers and Artists Protest, two peacenik groups dominated by Communists and fellow travelers; the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); and the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"). In 1965, Geismar participated in the first Socialist Scholars Conference. In 1966, he sponsored the Congressional candidacy of Communist leader Herbert Aptheker. He supported the Free (Filthy) Speech Movement at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, saying, "This trouble on the campus is just about the best thing that has happened to American education since the end of World War II."

EUGENE GENOVESE was born on May 19, 1930 in Brooklyn, New York, son of Lena Chimenti and Dominick Genovese. He has been married twice. He is an alumnus of Brooklyn College (B.A., 1953) and Columbia University (M.A., 1955; Ph.D., 1959). He is the author of *The Political Economy of Slavery*. He is, or has been in recent years, a member of the editorial boards of the *Journal of Social History*, the radical *Studies on the Left*, and *Science and Society* ("a Communist publication").

From 1958 until 1963, Genovese was an assistant professor of history at the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn. From 1963 until 1965, he was an assistant professor, and from 1965 until 1967, an associate professor, of history at Rutgers University. Since 1967, he has been a professor of history at Sir George Williams University in Montreal.

While at Brooklyn College, he was an organizer for American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist") and its successor Young Progressives of America ("youth wing of the Communist-controlled Progressive Party"). From 1947 until 1950, he was a member of the Communist Party. He claims that he was expelled from the party in 1950 when his comrades charged him with being "anti-Semitic, anti-Negro, and a Browderite right-wing deviationist." For his part, Genovese claims: "The real reason for my expulsion was I zigged when I was supposed to zag. Actually, I should have been expelled because I was violating party discipline."

In 1953 and 1954, Genovese spent ten months in the army. He was discharged on grounds that he had concealed his earlier Communist Party membership.

On April 23, 1965, at Rutgers University, Genovese spoke before a "teach-in" sponsored by Students for a Democratic Society. He reaped a nationwide harvest of headlines when he said: "Those of you who know me know that I am a Marxist and a Socialist. Therefore, unlike most of my distinguished colleagues here this morning, I do not fear or regret the impending Viet Cong victory. I welcome it."

During New Jersey's 1965 gubernatorial campaign, the Republican candidate, Wayne Dumont Jr., challenged the incumbent, Governor Richard Hughes, a Democrat, to urge the dismissal of Genovese from the Rutgers faculty. Hughes' reaction included the charge that Dumont's request was "the act of a desperate candidate making a cheap political issue out of free speech." He also said that Dumont had a "McCarthy syndrome." When Dumont continued to push for Genovese's dismissal from the state-operated Rutgers, Hughes replied that he was "determined to preserve academic freedom in its broadest sense." Then Hughes recommended that the Genovese matter should be subject to the judgment of Rutgers' board of governors, whose chairman was Charles H. Brower.

Before the board of governors came to a decision, a two-man subcommittee of New Jersey's State Assembly investigated and whitewashed Genovese, who they found had not used the classroom to promote his political beliefs. Also before the board of governors completed its deliberations, Genovese was promoted from assistant to associate professor and granted tenure.

Under Chairman Brower, Rutgers' governors decided that Genovese had in no way abused the privilege of academic freedom or violated professional ethics by his behavior as a scholar and as a teacher. And they did not find Genovese's actions to be reprehensible and detrimental to the university.

Genovese, the self-proclaimed Marxist and socialist, with his desire for a Viet Cong victory in Vietnam, was unmistakably a hero to the leftist establishment. Hughes, who prattled about academic freedom for Genovese, was supported in his position by New Jersey's senior United States Senator, Republican Clifford Case; by New York's United States Senator Robert F. Kennedy; by Rutgers' President Mason Gross; by Princeton University's President Robert Goheen; and by "Modern Republican" C. Douglas Dillon. *Time* magazine reached deep into the gutter to compare the Genovese case with the Dreyfus affair. Columnist Leslie Carpenter of the Hall Syndicate detected that "the foul smell of McCarthyism is in the air in New Jersey," and he smugly reported (August 15, 1965) that the "Rutgers board and the [New Jersey] Assembly subcommittee . . . determined . . . [Genovese] has never belonged to the Communist Party." (On August 12 – three days earlier – Genovese had announced publicly that he was expelled from the Communist Party in 1950, according to an item in the *New York Times,* August 13, 1965.)

The New Jersey Civil Liberties Union and Hyman Lumer, the editor of the Communist Party's *Political Affairs,* were on Genovese's side. Reporter Bruce Bahrenburg of the *Newark Evening News* seemed impressed that Genovese had sworn a loyalty oath when he became employed at Rutgers. And Bahrenburg, pleased that Genovese was whitewashed by Rutgers' board of governors, wrote: "It is a sign of the improved climate of public discussion that in the post-McCarthy era, Genovese feels he can publicly discuss his political views, even if they are considered foolish by persons in high places."

The *New Republic's* T.R.B. (alias Richard L. Strout of the *Christian Science Monitor*), with his customary leftwing doctrinairism, declared that "nothing more was at stake than academic freedom." In the *New Leader,* Lawrence Grauman Jr. found Genovese to be a target of vigilantes. Twenty Rutgers students formed the Committee for Free Speech in support of Genovese.

In the *New York Times Magazine* (December 19, 1965), Arnold Beichman's article, "Study in Academic Freedom," was not only favorable to Genovese but also quite revealing of Genovese's true ideological position. Wrote Beichman: "Genovese's political credo is fairly simple. He is contemptuous of the American Communist party, less contemptuous of the Soviet Union, strongly sympathetic – with some minor reservations – to Communist China. He feels congenial toward the Italian Communist Party, 'the closest to any radical movement in the West in finding the road to Socialism in the West.' "

Beichman interviewed Genovese after the New Jersey gubernatorial election, which was won by Hughes over Genovese's critic Dumont. " . . . Genovese said he was no longer 'a Leninist' although he believed that 'Leninism is a great force and has validity in the world today.' He doubted that 'American capitalism would give up peacefully, but Socialism should build on the idea of a peaceful transition. If, however, the state breaks down and refuses to use the democratic process, then the workers should defend themselves with arms.' Concerning [Red] China, he said that he was becoming 'alarmed at the increasingly theoretical rigidity of the Chinese.' He scoffed at China's assertion that Russia is going capitalist as 'just demagoguery.' On the other hand, he thought 'it is monstrous to say that China is guilty of aggression. It's because she has been so much under the threat of aggression that she has behaved this way.' "

During the period when Genovese's cheerleading for the Viet Cong was a cause célèbre, his apologists insisted that he was innocent of politicizing in the classroom. But according to the Beichman article Genovese himself demolished such unwarrantable assumptions: "Professor Genovese believes that as a teacher, not only does he have a right to discuss his political beliefs ["I am a Marxist and a Socialist"] in the classroom, but the subject he teaches makes such discussion inevitable. 'I teach Southern history and Negro history up to the present day,' he said, 'and I must discuss civil rights. Whatever I say in my analysis of the civil rights battle is affected by my politics. You can't avoid these issues.' "

Whatever cleavage may have existed between Genovese and the Communists in America before he achieved national notoriety was dissipated rapidly after he was exonerated by Rutgers' officials. In 1965, he was an honored guest at the seventeenth annual anniversary dinner of the Communists' *National Guardian.* He was a prominent participant in the Socialist Scholars Conferences of 1965 and 1967. In 1966, he participated in the *National Guardian's* Forum on Politics and Policy. In 1966, he supported Bertrand Russell's international war crimes tribunal, a project engaged in by Communists from all over the world. In 1966, he sponsored the congressional candidacy of Communist leader Herbert Aptheker. And from his Canadian teaching position, he has continued to preach the straight Communist line against American imperialism and American aggression [?] against the Communist world.

HARRY D. GIDEONSE was born on May 17, 1901 in Rotterdam, The Netherlands, son of Johanna de Lange and Martin Gideonse. (He was brought to the United States in 1904.) He married Edmée Koch. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (B.S., 1923; M.A., 1924) and the University of Geneva (Diplomé des Hautes Études Internationales, 1928). He is the author of *The International Bank* (1930), *The Higher Learning in a Democracy* (1937), *Organized Scarcity and Public Policy* (1939), *The Economic Foreign Policy of the United States* (1953), *On the Educational Statesmanship of a Free Society* (1959), and *Against the Running Tide*

(1967). His writings on economics are those of a Fabian Socialist and, on education, those of a thoroughly pragmatic John Deweyite.

From 1924 until 1926, Gideonse was a lecturer in economics at Barnard College and Columbia University. From 1926 until 1928, while pursuing his graduate studies, he served as director of international students' work in Geneva, Switzerland. From 1928 until 1930, he was an assistant professor of economics at Rutgers University. From 1930 until 1938, he was an associate professor of economics at the University of Chicago. In 1938 and 1939, he was a professor of economics at Columbia University and chairman of the department of economics and sociology at Barnard College. From 1939 until 1966, he was president of Brooklyn College. Since 1966, he has been a professor of economics and chancellor of the New School for Social Research, which was founded and has been perpetuated as a haven for native-born and alien radicals of the academic community.

During his tenure at Brooklyn, Gideonse was one of the very few university or college presidents to take a firm stand against Communist faculty members and Communist influences within the student body. His attitude was all the more unusual since he supported anti-Communist investigations by the State of New York and the Congress. His efforts, however, were generally futile since Brooklyn remained a hotbed of Red radicalism.

In the context of his entire career, Gideonse' anti-Communism was somewhat paradoxical. In the 1930's, he experienced more than a flirtation with the far Left. He was an advisor to Open Road, a Communist front; a sponsor of the National Emergency Conference, a Communist front; an affiliate of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, a Communist front; an affiliate of the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation; a member of the leftwing-pacifist American Friends Service Committee; a supporter of a Socialist candidate for political office; and an endorsee of the Communist-controlled Student Congress against War.

Gideonse has been a long-time member or non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations; a founder and president of Freedom House, a pillar of the leftwing Establishment; a member of the leftwing-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee, the International Movement for Atlantic Union, and the American Association for the United Nations. Since at least 1954, he has been a member of the leftist Committee of 100 in support of the NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund, a leading force in racial agitation.

Felix Wittmer remarked in his *Conquest of the American Mind* that "inasmuch as Dr. Gideonse was permitted to testify on Communism before the Jenner Committee [Senate Internal Security Subcommittee], he has acquired a sort of halo as an anti-Communist fighter." In truth, however, Gideonse was on the Left before, and has remained there since, his laudable testimony was given. Despite his detestation of Communism and his absolute distrust of Communists, he remains committed to ideological associations that are far left on the political spectrum.

ROLAND B. GITTELSOHN was born on May 13, 1910 in Cleveland, Ohio, son of Anna Manheim and Reuben Gittelsohn. He married Ruth Freyer. He is an alumnus of Western Reserve University (B.A , 1931) and Hebrew Union

College (B.H., 1934). He pursued graduate studies at Columbia University (1937-1939). In 1936, he was ordained as a rabbi.

From 1936 until 1953, Gittelsohn served as rabbi of the Central Synagogue of Nassau County, New York, and since 1953, he has been at Temple Israel in Boston, Massachusetts. He has been a radio preacher on "Church of the Air" (Columbia Broadcasting System) and "Message of Israel" (American Broadcasting System). In 1947, he was national chaplain of the Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A. He has been an officer of the Massachusetts Board of Rabbis, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, and the Central Conference of American Rabbis. He was elected president of Central Conference in 1969.

Gittelsohn served on President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights (1952), the Governor's Commission to Survey Massachusetts Courts (1955), and the Massachusetts Commission on Abolition of the Death Penalty (1957-1958). He received an award from the Freedoms Foundation in 1952. He is the author of *Modern Jewish Problems* (1935), *The Jew Looks at War and Peace* (1935), *The Jew Faces His Problems* (1938), *Little Lower than the Angels* (1955), *Man's Best Hope* (1961), *Consecrated Unto Me* (1965), and *My Beloved Is Mine* (1968).

Gittelsohn has been affiliated with the American Congress for Peace and Democracy ("Communist front"); the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign ("Communist front"), an affiliate of the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); and the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign").

In 1954, Gittelsohn petitioned against hearings of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on behalf of the leftwing agitators in the Southern Conference Educational Fund. In 1958, his name appeared in the Communists' *Worker* as a signer of a statement calling for Red China's admission to the United Nations. In 1960, he became an advisor to the racist agitators of the Congress of Racial Equality. In 1961, he signed a clemency petition on behalf of imprisoned Communists Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden. In 1962, he paid a birthday tribute to veteran Communist-fronter Louise Pettibone Smith. In 1964, he joined a host of Communists in sponsoring a memorial tribute to Communist W.E.B. DuBois.

Gittelsohn has been an active peacenik through his affiliations with the leftwing-pacifist Turn Toward Peace; the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the leftwing-pacifist International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam, an affiliate of the Clergymen's Emergency Committee for Vietnam of the Fellowship of Reconciliation; Negotiation Now!, organized by leftwingers Martin L. King Jr. and Joseph L. Rauh Jr.; and the Voters' Pledge Campaign, a 1966 effort to elect leftwing-pacifist candidates to office.

According to *Tocsin* (December 2, 1965), in an address to the Union of American Congregations on November 17, 1965, Gittelsohn urged a halt to bombing attacks on North Vietnam by American planes and charged that the United States government was guilty of lying in its dealings with Communist and other governments.

NATHAN GLAZER was born on February 25, 1923 in New York City, son of Tillie Zacharevich and Louis Glazer. He was married to and divorced from Ruth Slotkin. His second wife is Sulochana Raghavan. He is an alumnus of City College of New York (B.S., 1944); University of Pennsylvania (A.M., 1944); and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1962). He is the author of *American Judaism* (1957) and *The Social Basis of American Communism* (1961). He is co-author of *The Lonely Crowd* (1950, with David Riesman and Reuel Denney); *Faces in the Crowd* (1952, with David Riesman); and *Beyond the Melting Pot* (1963, with Daniel P. Moynihan). Among the publications to which he has contributed articles are: *Commentary, Fortune, Harper's, Saturday Review, American Scholar, Atlantic, New York Times, Nation,* and *Scientific America.* In 1954 and 1955, he was recipient of a Guggenheim fellowship. In 1956 and 1957, he was recipient of a Ford Foundation grant to write his *The Social Basis of American Communism.*

From 1945 until 1953, Glazer was on the editorial staff of *Commentary* magazine. From 1953 until 1955, he was an editor for Doubleday-Anchor Books. In 1955, he was a lecturer at the University of Chicago; in 1956 and 1957, a visiting professor at the University of California (Berkeley); in 1958 and 1959, an instructor at Bennington College; and in 1959 and 1960, a visiting associate professor at Smith College. In 1960 and 1961, he was a fellow at the Joint Center of Urban Studies (Harvard University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology). In 1961 and 1962, he was in Japan for travel and study. In 1962 and 1963, he was an urban sociologist with the federal government's Housing and Home Finance Agency. From 1963 until 1969, he was a professor of sociology at the University of California (Berkeley). In 1968 and 1969, he lectured at Harvard University's Graduate School of Education, and since 1969, he has been a professor of education and social structure at Harvard University.

Through the impressive abundance of his writings, Glazer has become one of America's better known leftwing sociologists. No matter what the subject – race relations, education, law and order, congressional anti-Communist investigations, employment and/or unemployment, welfare, campus riots, urban problems, constitutional issues – his bent for socialism shows through his theories and analyses. He is not an activist (one of his few affiliations has been his long-standing official position with the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy). He is, however, a widely read reformer and planner, along lines that are familiar to those who have studied Socialist Party platforms of the past seventy years.

Glazer's philosophy was perhaps best exemplified by a piece he wrote for the *New York Times* (February 27, 1966), criticizing Lyndon B. Johnson's so-called War on Poverty. Glazer was not against the socialistic War on Poverty. He just did not think it went far enough: "My reservations about the antipoverty program are much like those of the critic who says the subject of the play should have been a different one. We decided what the subject should be in passing the Economic Opportunity Act, and I think the performance, in view of the difficulties of the script as I have outlined them, is better than we had a right to expect. But I think we still have to take on the jobs which the antipoverty program, as set up under the act, did not address itself to – reducing the unemployment rate, increasing the number of jobs, expanding and revising the Social Security and social-welfare systems, improving the systems of job training, job counseling and job placement, attacking the failures of school systems and police systems. The antipoverty program will permit us to experiment with a good number of ways of undertaking these tasks. In the end, however, a democratic polity cannot take the position that the major way to improve its institutions of government and welfare is to finance guerrilla warfare against them. It must take up the job of directly improving and transforming them."

ERIC GOLDMAN was born on June 17, 1915 in Washington, D.C., son of Bessie Chapman and Harry Goldman. He married Joanna Jackson. He is an alumnus of Johns Hopkins University (M.A., 1935; Ph.D., 1938). He is the author of *Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Early Career* (1943); *John Bach McMaster, American Historian* (1943); *Rendezvous with Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform* (1952 and 1956); *The Crucial Decade: America, 1945-1955* (1956); *The Crucial Decade – and After: America, 1945-1960* (1961); and *The Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson: A Historian's Personal Memoir* (1969). He is the editor of *Historiography and Urbanization* (1941). He is the co-author of *The World's History* (1947 and 1959). Among the publications to which he has contributed articles are the *New York Times Magazine, Harper's, Holiday, New Republic, Saturday Review,* and *Reporter.* He has contributed numerous book reviews to the *New York Herald-Tribune* (defunct) and the *New York Times.*

From 1935 until 1940, Goldman was at Johns Hopkins University, as junior instructor in history (1935-1938) and instructor (1938-1940). From 1940 until 1942, he was a writer on national affairs for *Time* magazine. Since 1942, he has been at Princeton University: as instructor (1942-1943); assistant professor (1943-1947); associate professor (1947-1955); professor (1955-1962); and since 1962, Rollins professor of history. In 1947, he was a Library of Congress fellow in American Civilization. In 1955 and 1956, he held a Guggenheim fellowship. In 1963 and 1964, he held a McCosh fellowship at Princeton University. He lectured under the auspices of the Department of State in Europe (1953-1954) and in India (1957). Since 1959, he has been moderator of NBC-TV's panel program, *The Open Mind.*

From December 1963 until September 1966, Goldman served as a special consultant to President Lyndon Johnson. In the official announcement of his unpaid appointment, it was said that Goldman would "serve as co-ordinator for the reception of the nation's scholars and specialists . . . [and] help keep a continuous flow of specific proposals, general approaches, and opinions from a wide range of experts outside the government." The President said that Goldman would be the White House's "window to the world of ideas." Others described Goldman as the "house intellectual" of the Johnson Administration.

Shortly after his appointment was publicly announced, Goldman described the type of "scholars and specialists" who would be called upon by him for advice: "The President is a liberal. I'm a liberal. The group will be of a liberal persuasion." In May 1964, Goldman lived up to his promise when he released the names of the "scholars and specialists" he had recruited. They were invariably of a leftist-liberal persuasion and included John Kenneth Galbraith, Richard Hofstadter, Margaret Mead, David Riesman, Clinton Rossiter, and Eugene Rostow.

One of the highlights of Goldman's special consultant career occurred in 1965 when he organized the White House Festival of the Arts. Among the leftwingers invited to the Festival were Saul Bellow, Catherine Drinker Bowen, John Hersey, Dwight Macdonald, Phyllis McGinley, and Mark Van Doren. Robert Lowell, the poet who served six months in federal prison during World War II for refusing to be drafted, was invited; he issued a public declination to attend and used the opportunity to blast Lyndon Johnson's foreign policy. Other leftwing "intellectuals" joined Lowell in his protest: John Berryman, Alan Dugan, Alfred Kazin, Bernard Malamud, Mary McCarthy, Philip Roth, and W.D. Snodgrass.

At the Festival, John Hersey read a passage from his leftist-pacifist *Hiroshima.* Dwight Macdonald collected signatures on an anti-Vietnam War petition. But Robert Lowell garnered more publicity from his refusal to attend than was gained by the entire Festival. Goldman had suffered a disaster.

In September 1966, Goldman tendered his resignation as special consultant. He had decided that he had accumulated enough frustrations as a result of the President's anti-intellectual attitude, and he memorialized his experiences in *The Tragedy of Lyndon Johnson.*

Goldman had been used sparingly by Lyndon Johnson. He helped to write a few presidential speeches. He wrote lengthy memoranda which the President may or may not have read. And he served as an advisor to Mrs. Lyndon Johnson.

Goldman's credentials as a leftist-liberal are undeniable. His *Rendezvous with Destiny* and *The Crucial Decade* are literate chronicles of liberals' achievements; but Goldman's apologetics far outweigh his objective judgments. He is haunted by memories of "McCarthyism." Of the Vietnam War, he has written that it is a "dismal product of extreme pragmatism, blunderbuss anti-Communism and rampant amorality." His admiration for liberalism and disappointment in some liberals were probably best expressed in an article he wrote for the *New York Times Magazine* ("The Liberals, The Blacks and the War," November 30, 1969), in which he said: "Through all the ups and downs in the long history of American liberalism, its bedrock strength has been its moral authority. The movement caught up the yearnings of centuries of the Hebraic-Christian tradition and of American idealism. It spoke human needs vs. the claims of property, of decency and compassion, the credo that the most ordinary men have the right to material comfort, to know self-respect and a touch of joy in living. This moral authority won generation after generation of followers. It gave the individual liberal the inner strength of feeling that he marched with a glorious cause, and it blunted wave after wave of attacks.

"But the performance of many liberals on the issues of the black revolution and the Vietnam War has permitted the left and the right to mount a criticism which adds up to a challenge of this very moral authority. Liberalism was one thing when it spoke through the voice of a Clarence Darrow, a Reinhold Niebuhr, a Franklin Roosevelt – demanding justice, education, jobs, housing, expanding opportunities for the little man – or even through the voice of a Woodrow Wilson, summoning the nation to arms against German militarism. Liberalism is scarcely filled with moral grandeur when a conspicuous number of its representatives engage in urging a squalid Vietnam War or in running away from its consequences, in holding back on opportunities for Negroes or in encouraging the worst instincts of a tragically depressed people. Little wonder that the attacks of the left and the right have been so telling. Little wonder that many a thoughtful liberal knows that special malaise which consists of wondering just how noble he and his friends are.

"A movement with its moral mandate sullied, suffering the consequences of too much success, stumbling over the most vital issues of its era, daily ripped apart by numerous, indefatigable and skillful critics – how much is left of liberalism? How much ought to be left?"

Despite the delinquencies of some liberals, Goldman is optimistic for the future of liberalism, if liberals heed his advice: "The basic need is for liberalism to get back to its cardinal doctrine, those rights of ordinary men, redefined to read *all* ordinary men, in *all* the aspects of their public life. This requires drastic shifts in the mental and emotional processes of many liberals. They will have to accept the fact that the frustrating complexities of foreign policy, as much as and perhaps more than domestic legislation, affect everyday living. They must help Negroes into the free and equal play of American society, without either rationalizing impediments to black progress or frolicking in self-gratifications exploited from Negro distress. They will even have to recognize a reality which is none too palatable to a liberalism presently dominated by upper-income, well-educated Americans: The fellow in Levittown, sore beset by the same surge of social forces which took him out of a slum – beer can, TV evenings, bad grammar and all – is part of the constituency to which they are committed."

HENRY B. GONZALEZ was born on May 3, 1916 in San Antonio, Texas, son of Genevieve Barbosa and Leonides Gonzalez. He married Bertha Cuellar. He graduated from San Antonio Junior College. He attended the University of Texas. He is an alumnus of St. Mary's University Law School (B.A. and LL.B.).

Before Gonzalez entered public office, he worked at a variety of jobs: translator, public relations counselor, probation officer, and family relocation director for the San Antonio Housing Authority.

From 1953 until 1956, Gonzalez was a member of San Antonio's City Council, and during 1955 and 1956 he served as mayor pro tem. From 1956 until 1961, he was in the Texas Senate. In 1961, he was elected to the United States House of Representatives on the Democratic ticket to fill the unexpired term of Paul Kilday, who had resigned. (Gonzalez was the first Texan of Mexican ancestry to serve in the House.) He has been re-elected to successive Congresses.

In the Congress, Gonzalez has been unsurpassed in his devotion to paternalism as the prime reason for the existence of the federal government. The Kennedy and Johnson Administrations could always rely upon Gonzalez' voting support across the entire spectrum of

New Frontier-Great Society legislation. The ultra-leftist Americans for Democratic Action have had Gonzalez' support in their legislative program on almost one hundred per cent of their issues. (Gonzalez did, however, resign from the ADA in 1968 when the group endorsed the presidential candidacy of Eugene McCarthy. Gonzalez was a grateful protégé of Lyndon B. Johnson, and at the time of ADA's action Johnson had not announced that he was not a candidate for re-election.)

Whereas many of Gonzalez' liberal colleagues defect from the left on some issues, he labors above and beyond the call of duty on the side of the extreme left. He believes that the federal government should be financially responsible for the education of physicians, dentists, and public health personnel. For "the parents of every American child, as their birthright," Gonzalez has proposed that the federal government pay a monthly children's allowance – eight dollars monthly for pre-school children, and twelve dollars monthly for school-age children. He introduced legislation that would have the federal government guarantee a job in private industry [!] or in some level of government to every American.

Gonzalez habitually reminds his audiences that he comes from and represents a "minority" group – Mexican-Americans. From this ethnic base, Gonzalez has been in the vanguard of the civil rights enthusiasts. He exulted over Martin L. King's March on Washington. He was enraptured by the Supreme Court's one-man-one-vote decision. He has fought for low-income housing, rat control, model cities, and the entire "war on poverty" boondoggle.

On foreign policy matters, Gonzalez' behavior has bordered upon the incredible. Long after the Alliance for Progress had been relegated to the memory hole by most of its original enthusiasts, Gonzalez sang its praises in an annual speech. As late as 1965, he talked of the "emergence of Fidel Castro as the leader of Cuban nationalistic [!] aspirations."

In his travels, Gonzalez met the veteran Caribbean Communist Juan Bosch, of whom he said: "Dr. Bosch is a most intelligent, personable individual, who also revealed his deep love for his country and his desire to contribute to its progress and betterment."

Gonzalez is a ban-the-bomb addict, haunted by the "strontium-90" threat. On the domestic scene, he favors extensive federal gun-control laws. On foreign "aid" programs, he is a model of extravagance, and is especially partial to handouts for Latin America.

CHARLES E. GOODELL was born on March 16, 1926 in Jamestown, New York, son of Francesca Bartlett and Charles Goodell. He married Jean Rice. He is an alumnus of Williams College (A.B., 1948) and Yale University (LL.B., 1951; M.A., 1952). He received his master's degree on a Ford Foundation scholarship.

In 1950 and 1951, Goodell was a science instructor at Quinnipiac College in New Haven. In 1951, he was admitted to the Connecticut bar. In 1952 and 1953, he was a first lieutenant in the Air Force, serving as a defense attorney and prosecutor in court-martial cases. In 1954, he was admitted to the New York bar. In 1954 and 1955, he was a Congressional liaison assistant in the U.S. Department of Justice. From 1955 until 1959, he practiced law in Jamestown, New York.

From 1959 until 1968, Goodell – a Republican – was in the House of

Representatives. In 1968, New York's Governor Nelson Rockefeller appointed Goodell to fill the unexpired term of U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

From a panoramic perspective of Goodell's Congressional career, he has flirted with conservatism, courted moderation, and married ultra-liberalism. When he was appointed to the Senate, the *New York Times,* with its customary dissemblance, described his Congressional record as "moderate conservatism." Columnist Mary McGrory has traced his career from "regular Republican" to "swinging liberal." Of himself, Goodell says that during his first four years in Congress he voted the Republican line. Then, in 1963, he decided to become more independent. Along the way, he adopted a political philosophy of "positive alternatives." (Positive alternatives, in essence, were Goodell's statist and socialist counter-proposals under the Republican label to the statist and socialist measures of Kennedy's New Frontier and Johnson's Great Society.)

During the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, Goodell often assumed the posture of a conservative or moderate by criticizing some feature of a proposed bill. He argued against specific but not general features of Kennedy-Johnson legislation. But in the long run he took his place on the far left of the Congress, regardless of party labels.

In the House of Representatives, Goodell proved to be one of that body's most militant civil rightists. He took great pride in his working association with the Congress of Racial Equality, which resulted in the incorporation of a "black capitalism" plank in the 1968 Republican platform.

Goodell was a member of the House Education and Labor Committee. From time to time, he spoke against some feature of federal-"aid"-to-education measures, but in totality he proved to be committed to the most wildly spendthrift programs offered by the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. He was one of the first to propose a "head start" program and a "job corps." When the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Job Corps programs were shown to be riddled with corruption, he acknowledged the corruption but insisted that he was all for the programs in principle. He voted for Lyndon Johnson's boondoggling "war on poverty," but under his gimmick of "positive alternatives," he preferred to call it the Opportunity Crusade, in which functions of the Office of Economic Opportunity would not be eliminated but merely shunted to other federal agencies.

Consistency has never been one of Goodell's virtues. When he was promoting his "Opportunity Crusade," he insisted that the states and private industry should assume a greater share of the "war on poverty." Not long after, however, he complained: "Spiraling welfare and education costs have been placing an intolerable burden on State and local taxpayers." His solution? "The Federal Government must meet a greater share of these costs, in order to permit the States and localities to set their fiscal house in order, and to relieve State and local taxpayers." On another occasion he expanded upon this theme of robbing Peter to pay Paul: "I have long urged that the Federal Government bear a larger proportion of the rapidly rising welfare costs . . . . I also have long supported a system of Federal block grants for education."

Early in his career, Goodell voted to support the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He even voted against a foreign "aid" bill because some handouts would go to pro-Communist countries. But in the Senate Goodell was haunted by the spectre of "McCarthyism" as he opposed the confirmation of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board. And to complete his anti-anti-Communist image, Goodell has deplored the anti-Communist measures taken by the military regime in Brazil. He has also become a vigorous critic of the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Not long after he became a Senator, Goodell announced that he was not a "prisoner of past ideologies," and that "anyone who hasn't changed in the last three years isn't living." It would seem that, to prove his point, he has grasped the left side of every public issue, both in and out of the Senate.

Goodell has agitated for an all-volunteer army "subject to strict civilian control." Until such an army is a fact, he wants the draft system replaced – as it has been – by a lottery. But he also insists that there should be more liberal recognition of what constitutes a conscientious objector, since he is sympathetic to those who are conscientiously opposed "to war in the present historical context."

Goodell favored the appointment of Abe Fortas to be Chief Justice of the United States. He was a strong booster for the ultra-liberal James E. Allen Jr. to become U.S. Commissioner of Education. He endorsed the New York City mayoralty candidacy of John Lindsay rather than that of the Republican nominee John Marchi. He endorsed the Los Angeles mayoralty candidacy of Thomas Bradley, who was also endorsed by the Communist Party and the "New Left." He called for the resignations of FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover and Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey. He pays homage to the late racial agitator Martin L. King Jr. and to the senior Senator from New York, the ultra-leftist Jacob Javits.

Goodell has catered to the black powerites by his vigorous support of civil rights legislation, by his crusading for open housing, by his urging of compulsory integration of schools, by his extravagant suggestions for federal spending on urban "problems," and by his sponsorship of federal manpower training legislation.

Goodell has been a scaremonger on the issues of hunger and malnutrition. He has supported minimum wage legislation, socialized medicine, and increased social "security" benefits. He has been a staunch defender of leftwing foundations. He has stumped to lower the voting age to eighteen in all federal, state, and local elections. He rails against the military-industrial "complex" and is opposed to the maintenance of an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system. On the other side of the coin, he was in the vanguard of those who worked for ratification of the so-called nonproliferation treaty.

Foreign policy has been the object of a few forays by Goodell. He has made the usual Liberal obeisance to Israel, which speaks more for his awareness of an ethnic vote in New York than for anything constructive he has to offer in the way of a solution for the Mideast crisis. The same was true when he took the side of the Catholics during the 1969 troubles in Northern Ireland. He made a dramatic trip to Biafra for a first-hand look at the civil war raging there. (He carried a large towel on the Biafran trip. Mrs. Goodell announced that he hoped to adopt a Biafran refugee and he would carry the baby home, wrapped in the towel. He returned without the refugee and he was apparently subdued by what he had seen in Biafra.)

When Goodell was in the House of Representatives, he seemed undecided as to what stance he should take on the Vietnam War. In 1966, he said that United States withdrawal from Vietnam would "whet the appetite of our foes for further conquest. It would be, not the end of a war, but a prelude to a larger, bloodier, more costly war." By 1968, when he was appointed to the Senate, Goodell's sentiments on the war seemed to have reversed, for he said that the United States "should not be involved in a ground war in Southeast Asia." By 1969, he was an unmistakable dove. He expressed sympathy for mutinous American soldiers who objected to service in Vietnam. He was wholeheartedly in favor of the Red-saturated Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations. And in 1969, he introduced in the Senate the Vietnam Disengagement Act, under which Congress would not appropriate funds to maintain American military personnel in Vietnam after December 1, 1970 – undoubtedly the most extreme dovish measure yet offered in the Congress.

PAUL GOODMAN was born on September 9, 1911 in New York City, son of Augusta and Barnett Goodman. He has been married and divorced. He has a common-law second wife. He is an alumnus of the City College of New York (B.A., 1931) and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1954). He has been a prolific writer: poems, plays, novels, essays, short stories, literary criticism, and non-fiction. His best known works are *Growing Up Absurd* (1960) and *People or Personnel* (1965). He has been a film editor for the leftwing *Partisan Review* and a television critic for the leftwing *New Republic.* His writings have appeared in *Dissent, Commentary, Esquire, Playboy, Mademoiselle, Symposium, Nation, New York Review of Books, Harper's,* and *Commonweal.* Since 1960, he has been an editor of David Dellinger's ultra-leftwing *Liberation* magazine.

From 1935 until 1940, he was an instructor at the University of Chicago. Later he held teaching positions at the Manumit School of Progressive Education (Pawling, New York) and Black Mountain College in North Carolina. He was fired from these three institutions for his sexual perversities. He has also taught or lectured at the New School for Social Research, New York University, Sarah Lawrence College, the University of Wisconsin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of Pennsylvania, Western Reserve University, Columbia University, the University of California, and the Experimental College at San Francisco State College. Under the auspices of the ultra-leftwing Institute for Policy Studies, where he holds a fellowship, he has conducted seminars at various campuses on the topic of "Education and the Great Society." (Goodman's views on education are rather unusual. He has suggested that school attendance be voluntary at all levels. He has proclaimed that extensive schooling is "not only inept, it is psychologically, politically, and professionally damaging." He believes in widespread experimentation as a substitute for traditional educational institutions and procedures. Writing in *Saturday Review* [May 18, 1968], Goodman said: "Most of the money now spent for high schools and colleges should be devoted to the support of apprenticeships; travel; subsidized browsing in libraries and self-directed study and research; programs such as VISTA, the Peace Corps, Students for a Democratic Society, or the

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee; rural reconstruction; and work camps for projects in conservation and urban renewal. It is a vast sum of money – but it costs almost $1,500 a year to keep a youth in a blackboard jungle in New York; the schools have become one of our major industries. Consider one kind of opportunity. Since it is important for the very existence of the republic to countervail the now overwhelming national corporate style of information, entertainment and research, we need scores of thousands of small independent television stations, community radio stations, local newspapers that are more than gossip notes and ads, community theaters, high-brow or dissenting magazines, small design offices for neighborhood renewal that is not bureaucratized, small laboratories for science and invention that are not centrally directed. Such enterprises could present admirable opportunities for bright but unacademic young people to serve as apprentices.")

In a *Commentary* magazine symposium ("Liberal Anti-Communism Revisited," September 1967), Goodman said of himself: "I doubt that I belong in this symposium. I have always – since about age 19 – been 'anti-Communist,' if Communism means a strongly statist regime repressive of liberties. But I have never been 'liberal,' if liberalism means social engineering, a fetishism of parliaments without leavening by populism and civil disobedience, and/or a heavy reliance on the profit motive. I am metaphysically democratic and would not oppose an authentic General Will (though I would go into exile if it were too disgusting); but in fact in the so-called democracies, there is little real democracy because of baronial corporations, semi-monopolized mass media, and entrenched bureaucracies . . . . Neither am I 'of the Left,' if this means preferring socialism as an economy. For certain underdeveloped regions and for certain aspects of very advanced technologies, social control seems to be most efficient; and pure socialism across the board has moral virtues. But a free market and individual enterprise, if they can be maintained, also have moral advantages and have certainly proved themselves economically. But whatever the economy, to me the important tests are whether there is the possibility of countervailing political power and whether people have real options as to their style of life . . . . The present American system is so base and ugly that I think I would prefer 'socialism,' but it would have to be loose indeed to allow as much individual safety and freedom of enterprise as I consider indispensable for human growth."

During the course of the *Commentary* symposium, Goodman offered these generalizations on Americans and anti-Communism: "During this century the Americans have been only too open to conceptions like anti-Communism. Smug, lusting for private goods, plunged into One World with narrow ideas; with capital and labor tied to a swollen subsidized war economy; with technology and management expanding overseas; and withal, most individuals being powerless and anxious, and prone to irrational identifications and projections – it was not hard for such a people to be sold both the American Century and the Communist Menace by [William R.] Hearst, [Henry] Luce, [Francis Cardinal] Spellman, Chambers of Commerce, the lobbyists of the Armed Forces committees [*sic*], J. Edgar Hoover, etc., etc. This process did not need radicals and professors. The chief effect of the more rational anti-Communism of intellectuals has been to confuse themselves and *to make it impossible for them to take a revolutionary stand against the home threat to American democracy, and to conspire with their fellows internationally to fight for peace."*

Goodman has often described himself as an "anarchist" or "community anarchist," but neither description is accurate. He does not advocate an absence of government but rather a government that conforms to his standards. However, when he writes in the area of political science, he is a model of inconsistency. He has urged the elimination of national boundaries in favor of economic regionalism. Yet he has also said: "If ten thousand people in all walks of life will stand up on their own two feet and talk out and insist, we shall get back our country." (The shallowness of his political science is most apparent when he can find little difference between the Soviet Union and the United States. In his view, both are similarly centralized and nationalistic, both have large military establishments, both are committed to the Cold War. He offers no more points of comparison and none of contrast.)

Richard Kostelanetz, writing in the *New York Times* (May 5, 1968), said of Goodman that he was a "father figure to many academic dropouts," "the guiding spirit behind the 'Free Universities,' " and the "non-resident philosopher of the Berkeley Free [Filthy] Speech Movement" at the University of California. The attraction Goodman had for the campus revolutionaries can be explained – at least, in part – by his expressions for pacifism, his anti-Vietnam War posture, and his ultra-libertarianism. In turn, Goodman admires the youthful revolutionaries. Writing in the *New York Times* (September 14, 1969), he said: "The irony was that I myself had said 10 years ago, in *Growing Up Absurd,* that these young were growing up without a world *for* them, and therefore they were 'alienated,' estranged from nature and other people. But I had then been thinking of juvenile delinquents and a few Beats; and a few years later I had been heartened by the Movement in Mississippi, the Free Speech protest in Berkeley, the Port Huron statement of S.D.S. [Students for a Democratic Society], the resistance to the Vietnam war, all of which made human sense and were not absurd at all . . . . Every one of these young grew up since Hiroshima. They do not talk about atom bombs – not nearly so much as we who campaigned against the shelters and fall-out – but the bombs explode in their dreams, as Otto Butz found in his study of collegians at San Francisco State, and now George Dennison, in *The Lives of Children,* shows that it was the same with small slum children whom he taught at the First Street School in New York. Again and again students have told me that they take it for granted they will not survive the next 10 years . . . . Whether or not the bombs go off, human beings are becoming useless."

ALBERT GORE was born on December 26, 1907 in Granville, Tennessee, son of Margie Denny and Allen Gore. He married Pauline La Fon. He is an alumnus of State Teachers College of Murfreesboro (B.S., 1932). He studied law in night school at the YMCA in Nashville.

Before and during his years at Murfreesboro, Gore was a rural school teacher. From 1932 until 1936, he was superintendent of education for Smith County in Tennessee. In 1936, he was admitted to the Tennessee bar and established his private law practice in Carthage. In 1936 and 1937, he was commissioner of labor for Tennessee.

From 1939 until 1953, Gore served in the House of Representatives from Tennessee's fourth congressional district. Since 1953, Gore has been in the United States Senate.

During his career in the House of Representatives and in his first term in the Senate, Gore was rather unobtrusive – one of many Democratic hacks, following the party's leadership and its program of welfarism and internationalism.

With the advent of the Kennedy Administration, however, Gore blossomed as a leading leftist with an especial preoccupation with foreign policy. As a late-comer to the heady area of foreign affairs, he has demonstrated a flair for contradictions and inconsistencies.

In 1961, when a personal confrontation was proposed between President Kennedy and the Soviet Union's Premier Khrushchev, Gore was opposed to the meeting because he insisted that he did not trust Khrushchev. A year later, Gore was happy that the meeting took place. Somehow Gore had forgotten that the Kennedy-Khrushchev exchange was a most embarrassing diplomatic debacle for Kennedy. However, in 1962, Gore was taking a rosy view of American foreign policy. He somehow discovered that Kennedy had brought about the political unity of free world nations. The creation of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the creation of the Peace Corps, and the United Nations-United States aggression against the Congolese province of Katanga were hailed by Gore as major steps toward world peace.

In 1961, Gore preached that there should be no nuclear test ban treaty if the Soviet Union insisted upon a veto of a reliable inspection system, and he expressed shock when the Soviet Union resumed nuclear testing. He decided that the perennial Geneva Disarmament Conference was nothing but a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union.

Going from an iron-hard line to jelly-soft acquiescence was an easy transition for Gore when the Kennedy Administration called for conformity. Gore, in 1962, expressed his faith in John F. Kennedy's ability to negotiate a good nuclear test ban treaty, and by 1963, he became a major advocate of what became known as the Moscow Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. From an insistence upon a reliable inspection system, Gore retreated to speciousness as he argued that "because we could not obtain inspection, the Government of the United States finally had to take the best it could get, which was a limited agreement which we did not believe required inspection in the Soviet Union."

As he fought for ratification of the Moscow Treaty, Gore said: "If we must wait until the Russians have demonstrated conclusively and to the satisfaction of all that they will keep their word, we shall wait forever." Unwilling to wait forever, Gore threw caution aside and urged acceptance of the treaty even though, "unfortunately, the Soviets' record with respect to fidelity to trust is not very good." Five years later, without reservations of any kind, Gore fought tenaciously for the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. If he had discovered any evidence that the Soviets' "record with respect to fidelity to trust" had improved, he did not divulge the same to his colleagues in the Senate. (In 1969, Gore was a major opponent of the defensive ABM system as he warned about the threat of a nuclear holocaust.)

On the Vietnam War, Gore has always been a dove in the same cote as J. William Fulbright. In 1965, Gore argued that the Vietnam War was liable to bring the Soviet Union and Red China closer together, overlooking the reality that the Soviet Union and Red China were united in their support of North Vietnam. Gore's solution was to make the Vietnam War a responsibility of the United Nations.

In 1968, Gore suggested that "the best hope for peace" was the creation of a neutral, non-aligned status for Vietnam (North and South), Laos, and Cambodia. How this incredible panacea was to be achieved, Gore left unexplained. As another solution to end the war, Gore proposed that both North Vietnam and the United States halt the sending of troops into South Vietnam.

By 1969, Gore was as much at war with South Vietnam's government as Senator Edward Kennedy. He insisted that the Vietnam War was a political and civil war. And he argued that even a Communist government for all Vietnam would pose no real threat to United States national security. (In 1968, Gore supported the presidential aspirations of the ultra-pacifist Senator George McGovern. Since at least 1964, Gore has been favored with the support of the ultra-leftwing pacifist Council for a Livable World.)

In other areas of foreign policy, Gore has made ritualistic obeisance to the left. He has been completely committed to the United Nations. He has been a complete devotee of foreign "aid" programs. (As an example of his bias: he went all out to support "aid" for Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia, but in the case of a genuine ally of the United States, he ranted: "I know of no more repressive regime than the Chiang Kai-shek regime.") He supported Lyndon Johnson's "building-bridges-to-the-East" program, and he favors trade in non-strategic goods with any Communist country, including Red China. (Of course, Gore's concept of what constitutes strategic and non-strategic categories is identical with that of the ultra-leftists, who, since early in the Kennedy Administration, have decided that the most sophisticated materials sent to the Communist bloc – diesel engines, generators, ball and roller bearings, computers, tires, and virtually anything else that may be used in the manufacture of military equipment – are really useful only for peaceful purposes.)

In late 1968, Gore and his senatorial colleague Claiborne Pell visited Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. Upon their return, they urged the incoming Nixon Administration to expand United States contacts with the Communists in Eastern Europe by means of more cultural, scientific, and technological exchanges and increased trade, tourism, and consular relations. Somehow Gore and his companion could see "the inevitable erosion of Soviet-designed and Soviet-directed Communism in Eastern Europe." Although neither Gore nor Pell mentioned that Eastern Europe, at the dictation of the Soviet Union, was sending war material to North Vietnam to be used against American forces in a very hot war, they were anxious that the Nixon Administration should not resume a "cold war or even a cool war" against the Soviet Union.

While Gore, in recent years, has been making more and more excursions into foreign affairs, he has not neglected the domestic front. During the Johnson Administration, he was almost idolatrous of the President and the Great Society program. His only serious criticism was that Johnson was not enough of a spendthrift with the taxpayers' monies.

About the only domestic issue on which Gore has been unable to adopt a totally leftist stance has been the matter of civil rights. He has resorted to the strategy of straddling the fence between the advocacies of segregation and integration, in an effort to be all things to all constituents in the old Confederate State of Tennessee. However, as the years pass, Gore moves closer to the liberal agitators who are at war against the South and States' Rights.

LAURENCE M. GOULD was born on August 22, 1896 in Lacota, Michigan, son of Anna Updike and Herbert Gould. He married Margaret Rice. He is an alumnus of the University of Michigan (B.S., 1921; M.A., 1923; Sc.D., 1925).

From 1921 until 1931, Gould was on the geology faculty at the University of Michigan: as instructor (1921-1926); assistant professor (1926-1930); associate professor (1930-1931). From 1932 until 1963, he was at Carleton College: professor of geology (1932-1945); president (1945-1963). He became president emeritus in 1963, and in the same year became a professor of geology at the University of Arizona.

As a geologist and geographer, Gould has become internationally famous. He played a prominent role in Greenland, Baffin Island, and Antarctica explorations. In 1957 and 1958, he was director of the Antarctica program for the U.S. national committee in the International Geophysical Year. From 1963 until 1966, he was the U.S. representative on a special committee for Antarctica research of the International Council of Scientific Unions. From 1952 until 1962, he was on the national science board of the National Science Foundation. Few American scientists have been more honored by their colleagues and their own and other governments than Gould.

Away from the scientific field, Gould has shown a disposition to affiliate with the ideological left wing. He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union (two leftist, one-world groups); and the National Council for Civic Responsibility (an election year drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists). He has also been a trustee of the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching – two sources of financial benefits for the ultra-leftwing establishment.

FRANK GRAHAM was born on October 14, 1886 in Fayetteville, North Carolina, son of Katherine Sloan and Alexander Graham. He married Marian Drane. He is an alumnus of the University of North Carolina (A.B., 1909) and Columbia University (M.A., 1916). He also studied law for two years at the University of North Carolina, and in 1910, he received his license to practice law.

From 1915 until 1930, Graham was on the history faculty of the University of North Carolina as an instructor, assistant professor, and professor. From 1930 until 1949, he was president of the University. During his presidency, he was active off-campus in the New Deal-Fair Deal Administrations of Roosevelt and Truman. He was chairman of the National Advisory Council to the Committee on Economic Security. He was vice-chairman of the Consumers Board of the National Recovery Administration. He was a member of the presidential Committee on Education, the presidential Committee on Civil Rights, the National Defense Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and the Maritime War Emergency Board. Since 1947, with a year's interruption, he has been a mediator at the United Nations.

In 1949, Graham was appointed as a Democrat to fill the United States Senate vacancy caused by the death of the incumbent Senator from North Carolina. In 1950, he was an unsuccessful candidate for the same Senate seat.

Graham has frequently protested in public that he has been a life-long opponent of Communism and all other forms of totalitarianism. However, the public records of federal and state agencies reveal that he has had an unusual affinity for organizations that are so decidedly on the left that they have been cited as Communist, pro-Communist, and/or subversive sometime in their history. Among Graham's direct or indirect affiliations have been the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); American Friends of Spanish Democracy ("subversive"); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the China Aid Council ("Communist-controlled"); the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder ("Communist"); the Committee for a Boycott against Japanese Aggression ("Communist front"); the Coordinating Committee to Lift the [Spanish] Embargo ("Communist front"); the Council of Young Southerners (originated at the Youth Commission of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare – a "Communist front"); the International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); Lawyers' Committee on American Relations with Spain ("Communist lawyers' front organization"); the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("subversive and un-American"); the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax ("Communist front"); the National Council against Conscription ("Communist front"); the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Sharecroppers Fund ("Communist front"); the Southern Conference for Human Welfare ("Communist front"); the Southern Negro Youth Congress ("subversive" – "Communist front"); and the World Youth Congress ("Communist conference").

Graham, as a civil rightist, pacifist, one-worlder, leftwing internationalist and socialistic reformer, has also been affiliated with such leftist organizations as the United World Federalists; the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; the American Association for the United Nations; Americans United for World Organization; the American Association for a Democratic Germany; the Bureau for Intercultural Education; the Common Council for American Unity; the Council against

Intolerance in America; the Southern Conference Educational Fund; the American Civil Liberties Union; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; the League for Industrial Democracy; Americans for Democratic Action; Union for Democratic Action; and the Committee to Study the Organization of Peace.

As an apologist for the United Nations, as an enthusiast for civil rights demonstrations, as a critic of anti-Communist investigatory committees, as an advocate of universal disarmament, as an anti-anti-Communist, and as a statist, Graham has established himself as one of the most multi-faceted leftists in America during the past three decades.

DANA McLEAN GREELEY was born on July 5, 1908 in Lexington, Massachusetts, son of Marjory Houghton and William Greeley. He married Deborah Webster. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (B.S., 1931) and Harvard Divinity School (S.T.B., 1933). He was ordained to the ministry of the Unitarian Church in 1932.

From 1932 until 1934, Greeley was a minister in Lincoln, Massachusetts. In 1934 and 1935, he was a minister in Concord, New Hampshire. From 1935 until 1958, he was a minister at the Arlington Street Church in Boston, Massachusetts.

From 1945 until 1953, Greeley was also secretary, and from 1958 until 1961, president, of the American Unitarian Association. From 1961 until 1969, he was president of the Unitarian Universalist Association of North America. In July 1969, he became president of the International Association for Religious Freedom and Religious Liberalism, which has its headquarters at The Hague, Netherlands. He marched in Selma, Alabama, with his close friend, the racial agitator Martin Luther King Jr. He joined the leftwing National Committee for Responsible Family Life and Sex Education to promote SIECUS (Sex Information and Education Council of the U.S.) in its drive to promote sexuality as a necessary subject of school curricula, even on the kindergarten level.

Greeley has been affiliated with American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims (a Communist project); the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the clemency appeal for Julius and Ethel Rosenberg, the convicted atom spies; Arthur Larson's anti-anti-Communist National Council for Civic Responsibility, and Franklin Littell's anti-anti-Communist Institute of American Democracy, a department of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League; and the leftwing-pacifist International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam, an affiliate of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

In 1964, Greeley joined a host of leftwingers who, under the auspices of the ultra-leftist American Friends Service Committee, petitioned President Lyndon Johnson to call for a *unilateral* cease-fire in Vietnam. The petition echoed the Communist line that "the conflict in Vietnam is fundamentally a civil war," and the petitioners, ignoring the atrocities committed by the Viet Cong, charged: "American-trained South Vietnamese soldiers have clubbed down Buddhist nuns and priests with rifles we have given them. Our napalm bombs are now shrivelling South Vietnamese villages and villagers. There are published reports of our chemical poisons which defoliate their forests, destroy their crops, kill their cattle. Our artillery and machine guns are strafing the countryside in search of some guilty soul among the innocent."

In 1968, after a five-week tour of Japan, India, and South Vietnam, Greeley "discovered" that the United States conduct of the war, "especially its bombing attacks which injure civilians, is causing it to lose friends throughout the world as well as in Vietnam." Consequently, Greeley decided the war in Vietnam might be winning more friends for Communism than for "Democracy." He suggested that Communism and capitalism can co-exist in the world since, during the last generation, "each one has moved significantly in the direction of the other. It is time for us to submit our will to the will of the world. We can afford nothing less than a family of nations, a federation of nations, including every nation."

Greeley, who evidently could find no fault with the Viet Cong's conduct of the war, demanded that the United States halt its bombing of North Vietnam, de-escalate the general war effort, and enter into *unconditional* negotiations. Although Greeley has never served in the armed forces, he was not bashful about making military judgments, such as "The bombing of the north is not winning the war"; and although he could never seem to reproach the atrocious and terroristic Viet Cong, he insisted that even if the bombing of North Vietnam were winning the war "it would still be morally indefensible."

JAMES E. GROPPI was born on November 16, 1931 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. He was educated at St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee, and in 1959, he was ordained a Roman Catholic priest. He remained in Milwaukee and, from 1959 until 1963, was a curate at St. Veronica's Church, and from 1963 until 1970, at St. Boniface's Church.

By 1966, Groppi was the nation's most famous parish curate, a status recognized by the *New York Times,* which on September 30, 1966, made him the subject of its daily profile – "Man in the News."

Groppi's rise to national prominence was rather rapid. In 1963, he began a public career as a civil rights agitator. On several occasions, he traveled to Mississippi, where he participated in voter registration drives and integration sit-ins at restaurants. In March 1965, Groppi was arrested in Selma, Alabama, where he demonstrated under the auspices of the revolutionary agitator Martin L. King Jr.

After his arrest in Selma, Groppi returned to Milwaukee and assumed undisputed leadership of the most militant elements of that city's Negro community. He organized a four-day boycott against alleged de facto segregation of Milwaukee's public schools. At that time his activities were curtailed by orders of Milwaukee's Auxiliary Bishop, Roman R. Atkielski. A short time later, however, Groppi was arrested for blocking the site of a school under construction. He claimed that once the school was built, it would become racially segregated. (A few years later, Groppi was vociferous in his denunciation of racial integration. In 1968, he insisted that he did not want "to work for integration," and whites who won't integrate should move into Negro areas. As for himself: "I have no desire whatever to live in white America.")

In 1965, Groppi began a three-year directorship of the youth council of

Milwaukee's chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The youth council became the hard-core of agitators who followed Groppi in the demonstrations that have racked Milwaukee almost constantly since 1965. From the ranks of the youth council, Groppi recruited and trained a corps of commandos who have accompanied him as strong-arm bodyguards wherever he has traveled.

In the summer of 1966, Groppi sought trouble and found it with an eleven-day demonstration. His excuse was Milwaukee Circuit Judge Robert Cannon's membership in the Fraternal Order of Eagles, a national men's group with a membership of 850,000, which excluded non-Caucasians. Although seventeen of twenty-six Milwaukee judges were Eagles, Cannon – a liberal and a known opponent of the Eagles' discriminatory clause – was chosen as Groppi's target. Groppi argued that a judge who heard cases involving Negroes could not be a fair judge if he belonged to an organization that barred Negroes from membership. Although he cited no instances of alleged unfairness on the part of Judge Cannon, Groppi led his Negro youth council to the judge's home in the Milwaukee suburb of Wauwatosa. For eleven nights Groppi and his followers picketed Judge Cannon's home. Each night crowds gathered to heckle the Negro pickets. Violence erupted to such an extent that Milwaukee officials called upon Governor Knowles for help. The governor responded by sending five hundred National Guardsmen to maintain the peace. It was the first time in thirty-two years that the National Guard had been used for such a purpose in Wisconsin.

If Groppi sought publicity through his harassment of Judge Cannon, he received it in large measure. National television and radio, metropolitan newspapers, and the largest circulation news magazines treated him as if he were a victorious general emerging from a holy war. The target of his abuse, Judge Cannon, simply said: "I will remain in the Eagles as long as I live."

The Wauwatosa episode raised Groppi high in the ranks of the civil rights demagogues. His photograph became a familiar sight, especially in the liberal and far-left press. He became intoxicated with his own importance. He used his clerical garb and his priestly office as protective coloration for his inflammatory rantings. He became quick to brandish the clenched fist and to shout "black power" and "police brutality." He called himself "a Negro with a white skin" and pontificated that Jesus Christ was "the most radical civil rights leader we ever had."

Once Groppi became a national celebrity, he shed his early posture as a nonviolent crusader: "If these [nonviolent] strategies and tactics fail, how can you tell the Negro not to resort to violence? He has a right to it." – Riots by Negroes are a "legitimate way of fighting against a repressive structure." – "We will use whatever tactics are necessary to attain our ends . . . . We have used the brick, the bottle and the match and it [sic] has been effective on some occasions." – Stokely Carmichael and H. Rap Brown are "our Patrick Henrys, George Washingtons and Paul Reveres." – "We will use any tactic in the Milwaukee Youth Council we find necessary to overthrow the oppressiveness of present society." (In testimony before the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in 1967, Groppi told the Commission that Negroes should stop demonstrating and, instead, get guns, as "a constructive way of social protest.")

In June 1967, Groppi began one of his most prolonged demonstrations. The occasion was a vote of eighteen against one in the Milwaukee City Council, as it rejected for the fourth time in two years an open-housing ordinance. Groppi, speaking on behalf of his Negro followers, announced: "We're coming off the reservation. We're going to move where we want. We're going to live where we want." If Milwaukee did not adopt an open-housing ordinance, Groppi threatened: "Either we get what we want or we're going to turn this city upside down."

On August 28, 1967, Groppi led a group of two hundred demonstrators in a night march through the predominantly white-populated south side of Milwaukee. He repeated the performance on the following night. Sixty arrests were made and twenty-five individuals were injured seriously enough for hospital treatment. On August 30, Milwaukee's Mayor, Henry Maier, upon the advice of law enforcement officials, proclaimed a state of emergency and banned all marches, parades, and demonstrations between 4 p.m. and 9 a.m. for the next thirty days. (Mayor Maier despaired of trying to reason with Groppi: "Father Groppi is a white Uncle Tom. He's teaching the Negro to hate the white. That man does not want to get together with responsible people trying to help the Negro." After bitter experience with Groppi, Maier concluded: "I find he cannot be talked to. He does not love Negroes, he hates whites.")

On August 31, ignoring the mayor's proclaimed state of emergency, Groppi led more than five hundred of his followers on a march through Milwaukee streets. The police arrested Groppi and about 150 of the marchers. Groppi was released after posting $1,000 bail. He was not discouraged, however, and the nightly marches continued. (On September 2, in a change of tactics, Mayor Maier lifted his ban on marches, parades, and demonstrations but continued to keep in effect his proclamation that there was a state of emergency. On September 5, the City Council ratified the proclamation.)

On September 3, a thousand Groppi followers marched through Milwaukee streets. On September 4, six hundred demonstrators appeared before the home of Judge Christ T. Seraphim because the judge was a member of the Eagles. A few days later, eighty of Groppi's group invaded and ransacked the reception room at the mayor's office. The police, under the mayor's orders, stood by passively while the vandals wreaked their mischief. When Groppi was told what had transpired, he said: "I will not apologize." He not only condoned violence, he encouraged it. On September 17, he was interviewed on the nationally-televised CBS program, "Face the Nation." He said that "sporadic violence" by demonstrators was morally justifiable when they were seeking social change.

Eventually, Groppi's open-housing demonstrations extended for 234 consecutive days. The enthusiasm of his followers varied from week to week, as did the amount of violence and numbers of arrests. The police and city officials, no matter how strong Groppi's provocation, refused to be stampeded into rash actions. On one occasion during the course of the open-housing demonstrations, Groppi said: "I think the major problem in American cities today is the policeman. To the whites, he is the protector. To the black community, he is the oppressor. His image is that of the occupation army. And in most cases, they [the blacks] are right."

Finally, in April 1968, the Milwaukee City Council adopted an open-housing ordinance. It had no immediate effect upon the housing pattern of the Negro community, but for the first time in almost a year the streets of Milwaukee were relatively quiet at night. Groppi later boasted of that demonstrative period: "We filled our coke bottles with gasoline and stole furniture. My parishioners did it. My CYO [Catholic Youth Organization] members did it. I'll tell you what I told them. They said 'Black Power, Father.' I said, 'Black Power, don't get caught, Joe.' "

In the meantime, in February 1968, Groppi was tried and found guilty of resisting arrest during the August 31 disturbances. He was fined $500, which he paid, and was placed on two years' probation, which he appealed.

During the summer and fall of 1968, Groppi spent most of his time making speeches to civic, university, and church groups. He preached his usual "black power" sentiments but also began ranting the leftwing line on Vietnam. And, in November 1968, he resigned his leadership of the youth council, explaining that the group no longer needed his personal direction. But he continued travelling about the nation, reaping publicity and "awards." (The Associated Press selected Groppi as the religious newsmaker of 1967. The NAACP honored him in 1967 as their "most outstanding adviser." In 1968, the NAACP cited him for "arousing the conscience of the nation to the evil of segregated housing." B'nai B'rith, in 1968, gave him its inter-faith award. Also, in 1968, the Conference on Freedom of Residence called him the "national champion of open occupancy.")

Groppi's greatest moments of notoriety came on September 29, 1969. On that day, he led more than 1000 demonstrators into the Wisconsin Assembly Chamber, where a special legislative session was about to open. Groppi's mob, which was protesting a cut in Wisconsin's welfare budget, had been demonstrating for a week before its physical seizure of the Assembly's Chamber. The mob carried a red flag and a black power pennant into the Chamber. They sang "We Shall Overcome," shouted black power slogans, and during their eleven-hour occupation caused $26,000 damage in the Chamber.

Wisconsin's Attorney General secured a court injunction against Groppi and his mob's again interfering with the operation of government. A Milwaukee judge ordered that Groppi be taken into custody to determine whether he had violated the terms of his probation. Police in Madison arrested Groppi (he had sought sanctuary in a chapel) and charged him with disorderly conduct. The Wisconsin Assembly cited Groppi for contempt and ordered him jailed for the duration of the special legislative session. From his jail cell, Groppi said: "If I had to do this whole thing over again, I might be a little more militant – force them to drag us out or to use bayonets. We should have made them kill us."

On October 17, 1969, Groppi was jailed in Milwaukee when it was found that he had violated his probation by leading the occupation mob at Wisconsin's Assembly. Ten days later, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Thurgood Marshall ordered Groppi's release until the Supreme Court heard his case. On April 8, 1970, Groppi was also freed from the contempt citation which had been issued against him by the Wisconsin Assembly. Two days later, Groppi's ecclesiastical superiors announced that he was being reassigned from his parish. During the years when Groppi was arrested eleven times while becoming a hero to revolutionary black militants and ultra-left peaceniks, the same ecclesiastical authorities allowed Groppi to make a mockery of his priestly office. Only the gentlest of rebukes reached Groppi from his superiors as he allowed his church to be the center of revolution in Milwaukee.

CHAIM GROSS was born on March 17, 1904 in Austria, son of Lea Sperber and Moses Gross. He came to the United States in 1921 and was naturalized in 1934. He married Renée Nechin. He studied at the Beaux Arts Institute and the Educational Alliance Art School – both in New York City.

Since 1927, Gross has been a teacher of sculpture at the Educational Alliance Art School. From 1952 until 1957, he taught sculpture at the Museum of Modern Art. Since 1948, he has taught sculpture at the ultra-radical New School for Social Research. His works have been exhibited at major galleries and museums.

Gross participated in the Communist-organized 1947 May Day parade. He celebrated the 26th Anniversary of the Red Army. His affiliations include: Artists' Front to Win the War ("Communist front"); China Aid Council ("Communist controlled"); Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); Progressive Citizens of America ("subversive"); National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); *Masses and Mainstream* ("a Communist magazine"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); World Peace Congress ("Communist front"); National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); American Committee for Spanish Freedom ("Communist"); Civil Rights Congress ("Communist front"); American Peace Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); Citizens' Committee of the Upper West Side ("affiliate of the Communist Party"); American Artists School ("Communist front"); An American Group, Inc. ("Communist front"); American-Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); Sculptors Guild ("Communist front"); and the National Wartime Conference of the Professions, the Sciences, the Arts, the White-collar Fields ("Communist front"). He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

EWART G. GUINIER was born on May 17, 1910 in Ancon, Canal Zone, son of Marie Beresford and Howard Guinier. He has been married and divorced. He came to the United States in 1925 and became an American citizen in 1935.

From 1929 until 1931, Guinier attended Harvard University. During the next four years, he worked as an elevator operator at the *New York Times* and as a salesman for Harlem Research Laboratories. In the meantime, he attended the City College of New York at night and in summer sessions. In 1935, he received a bachelor's degree from CCNY.

From 1935 until 1939, Guinier worked successively for the welfare department in New York City and for the State of New York's Civil Service Commission. He was fired from both positions because of his Communist Party membership. In 1939, he received an M.A. in Personnel Psychology from Columbia University. Meanwhile, Guinier had joined the State, County & Municipal Workers of America (CIO). In 1939 and 1940, he was secretary for the national legislative committee of the SCMWA and, in 1941 and 1942, he was president of the New York district of the SCMWA. (The SCMWA, from its inception, was completely controlled by the Communist Party.)

In 1942, Guinier was executive secretary of the Negro Labor Victory Committee ("subversive and Communist"), and from 1942 until at least 1946, he was a member of the NLVC's executive board. During World War II, he was in the U.S. Army, where he carried on Communist activities. ("Guinier's military agitation included propagandizing troops at a Communist-run 'labor canteen' in Honolulu, and helping organize some of the big Communist-led demonstrations in 1945-6 to 'bring the troops home now.' " – *Combat*, October 1, 1969).

In 1946, Guinier became a salaried official (secretary-treasurer) of the State, County, and Municipal Workers. Then the SCMWA merged with the Federal Workers and became the United Public Workers (CIO), which Guinier served, successively, as secretary-treasurer of the New York district, regional director in New York, and secretary-treasurer of the national union. (There were only two national officers: Guinier and Abram Flexer, the president. In 1951, when asked about Flexer's and his own membership in the Communist Party, Guinier pleaded the Fifth Amendment. In 1950, the CIO had expelled the United Public Workers from its membership because "the policies and activities of the UPW are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution.")

In 1948, Guinier appeared before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee, where he testified against the anti-subversion Mundt-Nixon Bill. His testimony was not responsive to questions posed by the committee but rather was a racist tirade. Of interest, however, was Guinier's gratuitous observation that "all I know about the Communist Party is what I read in the papers." (At the time of his testimony, Guinier was a member of the New York State Committee of the Communist Party – and he held that membership at least until 1951.)

In 1949, Guinier was an unsuccessful candidate for Borough President of Manhattan. He ran on the ticket of the American Labor Party, which was nothing less than a political front for the Communist Party. In the same year, Guinier endorsed the candidacy of his friend Benjamin Davis, a Communist Party leader, who was running for the city council of New York on the American Labor Party ticket. However, Guinier's Red activities were not confined to his work in union affairs or in the hierarchy of the Communist Party. Among his front affiliations were the American Peace Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); the American Council for a Democratic Greece ("subversive and Communist"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the George Washington Carver School ("an adjunct in New York City of the Communist Party"); the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); the National Labor Conference for Peace ("Communist front"); the *March of Labor* ("an instrument of the Communist Party"); and the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party). Guinier also worked strenuously on behalf of the twelve Communist Party leaders who were convicted in 1949. Victor Riesel, the syndicated labor columnist, testified in 1951 under oath: "I think Ewart Guinier is one of the most effective Stalinist operatives that there is, who takes advantage of the fact that he is a Negro, because any attack upon him in this critical time is immediately turned into an attack upon the Negro people, which, of course, is fantastic, but because of that, Guinier has become a very powerful figure in Stalinist circles in New York."

In 1951, Guinier testified before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which was investigating the subversive control of the United Public Workers. His testimony was marked by speechifying, evasiveness, memory lapses, quibbling, and repeated pleas of the Fifth Amendment.

After his appearance before the SISS in 1951, Guinier retreated somewhat from Red labor's spotlight. In 1956, he entered upon graduate work at New York University, and in 1959, he received a doctorate in jurisprudence. In the 1960's, he became an associate director of the Urban Center at Columbia University.

On September 21, 1969, Harvard University announced the establishment of a new Department of Afro-American Studies, which would include an analysis of "the black revolution." Guinier was appointed chairman of the new department. The Harvard announcement and Guinier's appointment rated front-page notice in the *New York Times,* but in the lengthy story there was no hint that Guinier had ever been involved in Communist Party activities. He was portrayed as a former civil servant, an army veteran, a labor official, and a scholar.

WILLIAM HABER was born on March 6, 1899 in Rumania, son of Anna Stern and Leon Haber. He was brought to the United States in 1909. He married Fannie Gallas. He is an alumnus of the University of Wisconsin (B.A., 1923; M.A., 1926; Ph.D., 1927). He is the author of *Industrial Relations in the Building Industry* (1930); *Unemployment Relief and Economic Security* (1936); and *The Cost of Financing Unemployment Insurance in Michigan* (1952). He is a co-author of *Labor Relations and Productivity in the Building Trades* (1955); *Maintenance of Way Employment in United States Railroads* (1957); *The Michigan Economy: Its Potentials and Its Problems* (1960); *The Impact of Technological Change* (1963); *The Role of the United States Employment Service in a Changing Economy* (1964); *Programs in Aid of the Unemployed in the 1960's* (1965);*Michigan in the 1970's: An Economic Forecast* (1965); and *Unemployment Insurance in the American Economy* (1966). He is the editor of *Readings in Social Security* (1948) and *Labor in a Changing America* (1966). He is co-editor of *Manpower in the United States* (1954) and *Social Security Programs: Problems and Policies* (1961).

In 1926 and 1927, Haber was an

economics instructor at the University of Wisconsin. From 1927 until 1936, he was an associate professor of industrial relations at Michigan State College. Since 1936, he has been at the University of Michigan: as professor of economics (1936-1963); chairman of the economics department (1962-1963); dean of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (1963-1968); and since 1968, advisor to the University's executive officers.

Throughout his academic career, Haber's expertise in leftwing economics has been in great demand by various state and federal agencies. In 1933, he was a field representative in Michigan for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. From 1934 until 1936, he was administrator for Michigan's Emergency Welfare Relief Commission. In 1935 and 1936, he was director in Michigan for the National Youth Administration. In 1935 and 1936, he was deputy administrator in Michigan for the Works Progress Administration. In 1937, he was a consultant in Massachusetts for the Commission on Public Expenditures. From 1939 until 1945, he was a consultant to the Social Security Board. In 1941 and 1942, he was an assistant to the U.S. Budget Director. From 1942 until 1944, he was director of planning for the War Manpower Commission. In 1944 and 1945, he was an advisor to the director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. In 1948, he was an advisor to the U.S. military commander in Germany and the U.S. high commissioner in Austria. In 1950, he was a consultant to the U.S. Secretary of Labor. From 1947 until 1956, he served on the Federal Advisory Council on Employment Security. In 1961, he served on the President's Task Force on Depressed Areas. In 1962, he was an advisor to the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Haber was affiliated with the ultra-radical American Civil Liberties Union in its drive to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was affiliated with the Socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy, and in 1960, he received the John Dewey Award from the League for Industrial Democracy – an accolade coveted by leftists. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists.

NAJEEB E. HALABY was born on November 19, 1915 in Dallas, Texas, son of Laura Wilkins and Najeeb Halaby. He married Doris Carlquist. He is an alumnus of Stanford University (A.B., 1937). In 1937 and 1938, he studied at the University of Michigan Law school, and in 1940, he received an LL.B. from Yale University. He was admitted to the California bar in 1940 and practiced law in Los Angeles during the next two years. In 1942 and 1943, he was a test pilot for Lockheed Aircraft Corporation.

From 1944 until 1954, Halaby was in government service, successively as a naval aviator, chief of the State Department's intelligence coordination division, foreign affairs adviser to the Secretary of Defense, and as a deputy assistant to the Secretary of Defense. From 1954 until 1960, he was in the business world, successively as an associate in L.S. Rockefeller and Brothers, vice president of Servomechanisms, Inc., and executive vice-president and president of the American Technical Corporation. In 1960, he returned to private law practice. And, in the same year, he was a lecturer in the School of Business Administration and director of the defense studies program at the University of California at Los Angeles. In 1960, he was chairman of UCLA's disarmament conference.

From 1961 until 1965, Halaby was administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. From 1965 until 1968, he was senior vice-president of Pan American World Airways, and since 1968, he has been Pan Am's president. (Halaby's other activities in business have included directorships in the Bank of America, UniRoyal, and Whirlpool. He has been a trustee of Aerospace Corporation and a vice president of Janss Corporation.) As President of Pan Am, Halaby was chiefly responsible on the American side for the implementation of a reciprocal agreement whereby Pan Am and Aeroflot exchange weekly flights between New York and Moscow, despite huge financial losses to both airlines.

Halaby has been a member of the leftwing Urban Coalition of New York, the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States), and the Foreign Policy Association (one of the most effective propaganda outlets for the leftist Establishment).

In 1969, Halaby assumed the chairmanship of the Second National Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace, sponsored by the Fund for Peace. The Fund for Peace, under its earlier name of Fund for Education in World Order, had held its first National Convocation in 1969, but it had been a fiasco, despite the fact that those in attendance included a truly representative collection of disarmament-and-peaceful-coexistence promoters who were or had been in the high echelons of foreign policy makers within the federal government.

Halaby's accomplishments with the second National Convocation were impressive. He revived the Fund for Peace. He rallied support for the accommodation-appeasement lobby from the business community, including American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Riggs National Bank, the Boeing Company, Chrysler Corporation, the Bankers Trust Company, Bendix International, Control Data Company, Corning Glass, Hiram Walker & Sons, Encyclopaedia Britannica, and Bank of America. He recruited as sponsors for the National Convocation such leftwing organizations as Americans for Democratic Action, the League for Industrial Democracy, the Council for a Livable World, the National Committee for an Effective Congress, the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the New York Fellowship for Reconciliation, World Federalists, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Halaby's *pièce de résistance* for the 1970 National Convocation was the appearance of Soviet officials in seminars with American veterans of the notorious Pugwash Conferences. The meeting was represented by Halaby as a "dialogue" between private American and Russian experts who were primarily interested in world peace – especially a peace arrived at by cooperation between the governments of the Soviet Union and the United States. Enthusiastic participants at the National Convocation – most of whom had been at some time or another in federal governmental policy-making positions – included George Kistiakowsky, John Kenneth Galbraith, Richard Gardner, Arthur Goldberg, William C. Foster, Foy Kohler, Bernard Feld, James Roosevelt, Herman Kahn, Ernest Gross, Cyrus Vance, Robert Roosa, Adrian Fisher, Marshall Shulman, Morton Halperin, and Zbigniew Brzezinski. Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin and the U.S. Department of State endorsed the Convocation, which became, in fact, a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union's delegation masquerading as peace-seekers, and the one-world American leftists, whose abject pleadings for Soviet-American cooperation in a variety of areas served as trial balloons for State Department policy.

In effect, Halaby's 1970 National Convocation provided an important turning point in the history of U.S.-U.S.S.R. relations. His well-publicized spectacle gave the peoples of the world an impression that the most influential individuals in the business, academic, and governmental communities of the United States were anxious that the history of Soviet perfidy be forgotten, that the U.S. and U.S.S.R. be regarded as coequal goodwill partners in the pursuit of peace, and that the progress toward peace be recognized as so far advanced that even the most delicate questions could now be discussed in public: disarmament, arms control, cultural exchanges, and even mutual domestic concerns – violence, justice, and ecological problems. As Halaby expressed it: "A new era of global consciousness and interdependence is emerging."

JOHN HAMMOND was born on December 15, 1910 in New York City, son of Emily Sloane and John Hammond. He was married to and divorced from Jemison McBride. His second wife is Esmé O'Brien Sarnoff. He attended Yale University for two years.

Since 1933, Hammond has been associated with the recording industry in various capacities: recording director for English Columbia and Parlophone (1933-1936); associate recording director for Columbia Records (1939-1943; 1946); recording director for Majestic Records (1946-1947); vice president of the Mercury Record Corporation (1946-1952); and since 1954, a record director for the Vanguard Record Society. He has been a columnist and critic for *Down Beat* magazine (1933-1939); the *Brooklyn Eagle* (1934-1936); the *New York Compass* (1950-1952); the *New York Herald Tribune* (1953-1955); and *Saturday Review* (1958-1959). He has lectured at New York University (1953-1956), and has held executive positions with the Institute of Jazz Studies, Horizon Press, and Crisis Publishing Company. He was an organizer of Benny Goodman's Band and Count Basie's Orchestra. He has been an executive of the Newport Jazz Festival, which has been a showplace for Red-lining entertainers. He is director of talent acquisition for Columbia Records.

Hammond has been affiliated with the Artists' Front to Win the War ("Communist front"); the Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges ("subversive" – "Communist"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); the Workers Alliance ("subversive and Communist"); the Metropolitan Music School ("controlled by Communists"); the Musicians Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("Communist front"); the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners ("subversive and Communist" – "Communist front"); the National Committee for People's Rights ("entirely under the control of the Communist Party"); the National Scottsboro Committee of Action ("Communist front"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); *People's Press* ("Communist-line publication"); People's Songs ("subversive"); Progressive Citizens of America ("political Communist front");

and *Protestant* ("Communist front"). He has also been affiliated with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, financial backbone of racial agitators, including the "black power" revolutionaries; and he has been a vice president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century.

OSCAR HANDLIN was born on September 29, 1915 in Brooklyn, son of Ida Yanowitz and Joseph Handlin. He married Mary Flug. He is an alumnus of Brooklyn College (A.B., 1934) and Harvard University (A.M., 1935; Ph.D., 1940). He is the author of *Boston's Immigrants* (1941); *Commonwealth* (1947); *The Uprooted* (1951); *The American People in the Twentieth Century* (1954); *Adventure in Freedom* (1954); *Chance or Destiny* (1955); *Race and Nationality in American Life* (1957); *Al Smith and His America* (1958); *Newcomers: Negroes and Puerto Ricans in a Changing Metropolis* (1959); *John Dewey's Challenge to American Education* (1959); *Immigration as a Factor in American History* (1959); *The Americans* (1963); *Fire-bell in the Night: The Crisis in Civil Rights* (1964); *A Continuing Task* (1964); *History of the United States, Volume I* (1967); and *America: A History* (1968). He is a co-author and editor of several other volumes. His articles have appeared in *Saturday Review, Commentary,* the *New York Times* magazine, *Atlantic,* and various scholarly journals.

From 1936 until 1939, Handlin was a history instructor at Brooklyn College. Since 1939, he has been on the history faculty at Harvard University: as instructor (1939-1944); assistant professor (1944-1948); associate professor (1948-1954); and professor (since 1954). He has held the Winthrop and Charles Warren chairs in history. His *The Uprooted* won a Pulitzer prize for history. He has been a Guggenheim fellow and Brandeis University fellow.

Handlin's writings are demonstrably of a leftist-liberal bias. They appeal to sociologists and so-called social scientists whose view of history and current events is befuddled by an overwhelming reliance upon generalizations, statistics, polls, surveys, and pseudo-psychological analyses. Handlin's preoccupation with race, color, religion, and national origin converts even his historical writings into bleeding-heart social commentaries.

Handlin's off-campus activities reflect his position on the left-of-center. He has been on the Freedom House Bookshelf Committee, which was comprised of the most brazen leftists in the literary and academic world, including Gordon Allport, Cass Canfield, Bennett Cerf, Henry Steele Commager, Norman Cousins, Clifton Fadiman, Max Lerner, Archibald MacLeish, Ashley Montagu, Howard Mumford Jones, Elmer Rice, the Arthur Schlesingers, Junior and Senior, and Rex Stout. Handlin has been affiliated with the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. Handlin signed the ACLU's plea to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was also affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign").

Handlin was affiliated with the American Faculty Council for the Gradualist Way to Peace, a leftwing-pacifist group. He has been affiliated with the Southern Conference Educational Fund, the financial backbone of racial agitators, including the 'black power' revolutionaries. He signed the SCEF's petition to the President for clemency for Carl Braden, a Communist who had been convicted and imprisoned for contempt of Congress.

Handlin was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council foı Civic Responsibility, a Walter Reuther-inspired anti-anti-Communist hatchet crew used in the 1964 presidential campaign.

GEORGIA HARKNESS was born on April 21, 1891 in Harkness, New York, daughter of Lillie Merrill and J. Warren Harkness. She is an alumna of Cornell University (A.B., 1912) and Boston University (M.A., 1920; M.R.E., 1920; Ph.D., 1923). She pursued post-doctoral studies at Harvard University (1926), Yale University (1928-1929), and Union Theological Seminary (1936-1937). Between 1921 and 1967, Miss Harkness was the author of thirty books in the field of religion. Her autobiography, *A Special Way to Victory,* was published in 1964.

From 1912 until 1918, Miss Harkness was a high school Latin teacher in New York. In 1919 and 1920, while on a teaching fellowship, she was an instructor in the English Bible at Boston University's School of Religious Education. From 1922 until 1937, she was on the faculty of Elmira (N.Y.) College as an assistant professor of religious education (1922), an associate professor of philosophy (1923-1926), and a professor of philosophy (1926-1937). In 1926, she was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist Church. From 1937 until 1939, she was an associate professor of religion at Mt. Holyoke College. From 1939 until 1950, she was a professor of applied theology at the Garrett Biblical Institute of Evanston, Illinois. From 1950 until 1961, she was a professor of applied theology at the Pacific School of Religion at Berkeley, California. In 1956 and 1957, she was a professor of Christianity at the Japan International Christian University. Since 1961, she has been professor emeritus of the Pacific School of Religion.

In 1941, Miss Harkness – for her "pioneer work in religion" – received the General Federation of Women's Clubs Award. In 1958, she was named "churchwoman of the year" by Religious Heritage of America, Inc. She has received honorary doctorates from Boston University, MacMurray College, Elmira College, Wilson College, Mills College, and the Pacific School of Religion.

Miss Harkness has combined her teaching career with that of a fellow traveler. Among her affiliations have been the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the International Workers Order ("subversive and Communist"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); and the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"). She has also been involved in Communist Party or fellow traveler projects such as the Hiroshima Commemorative Committee; the Welcoming Committee for the Red Dean of Canterbury; the Rosenbergs' Clemency Appeal; an amnesty appeal for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act; a *Daily Worker* statement defending the Communist Party; a brief filed with the Supreme Court on behalf of the Communist Party; and the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam – an affiliate of the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation.

FRED R. HARRIS was born on November 13, 1930 in Walters, Oklahoma, son of Addie Person and Fred Harris. He married La Donna Crawford. He is an alumnus of the University of Oklahoma (B.A., 1952; LL.B., 1954). In 1954, he founded and became a senior partner of a law firm in Lawton, Oklahoma. He remained with the firm until 1964.

From 1956 until 1964, Harris was a member of Oklahoma's Senate. In 1962, he was an unsuccessful gubernatorial candidate. In 1964, he was elected for the two-year unexpired term of the deceased U.S. Senator Robert Kerr. He campaigned as a solid supporter of Lyndon B. Johnson's policies and he was backed in the campaign by the very wealthy and politically influential Kerr family. (In 1966, Harris was re-elected to the Senate.)

In the Senate, Harris proved to be an all-out liberal, supporting the Johnson Administration's domestic and foreign policies – notably civil rights and labor legislation. From 1965 until 1968, Harris was unswerving in his devotion to Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam War policy. But in 1968, after Johnson announced that he would not be a candidate for re-election, Harris suddenly became a dove and went so far as to advocate an unconditional halt to U.S. bombing of North Vietnam.

During the Johnson Administration, Harris' most spectacular achievement was his suggestion that Johnson create the Kerner Commission to investigate the 1967 rioting by blacks. Johnson appointed Harris to the Commission and he became its most influential member.

Through his work on the Kerner Commission, Harris could not find that the repetitious and widespread riots were the work of a conspiracy, nor did he discover that there was much in the way of planning behind the riots. He attributed the characteristic of spontaneity to most of the outbreaks and he settled on "poverty" as a factor contributing to the riots, which he contended were mainly the result of "white racism."

In 1968, Harris was in demand for heavy campaign work by Robert F. Kennedy and Hubert H. Humphrey. When Kennedy was slow to make his announcement, Harris became co-chairman of the Humphrey presidential campaign with his ultra-liberal senatorial colleague, Walter Mondale of Minnesota. (Harris let it be known that he was seriously considered as a vice-presidential running mate for Humphrey.)

In 1969, after a vigorous campaign for the job, Harris was chosen to be national chairman of the Democratic Party. In 1970, he relinquished the job. He had been spectacularly unsuccessful in alleviating much of the party's debt from the 1968 campaign, and factionalism within the party became an unusually serious problem during his tenure.

M[ARQUIS] LaFAYETTE HARRIS was born on March 8, 1907 in Armstrong, Alabama, son of Estelle Glenn and William Harris. He married Geneva Nelson. He is an alumnus of Clark University of Georgia (B.S., 1928), Gammon Theological Seminary (B.D., 1929; D.D., 1941), Boston University (S.T.M., 1930), and Ohio State University (Ph.D., 1933). He was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1928. He is the author of *The Voice in the Wilderness* (1941); *Our Tomorrow's World* (1945); *A Syllabus on Freshman Orientation* (1948); *To Magnify Thy Power* (1948); and *Life Can Be Meaningful* (1951).

From 1927 until 1929, Harris was an instructor in science and mathematics at Clark University. In 1930 and 1931, he was a physics and religion instructor at Claflin College in South Carolina. In 1932, he was a pastor in Columbus, Ohio. From 1933 until 1936, he was a dean and professor of sociology at Sam Houston College. From 1936 until 1960, he was president of Philander Smith College in Arkansas. Since 1960, Harris has been a bishop of the Methodist Church, serving the Atlantic Coast area. He has been active in the now-defunct leftist Federal Council of Churches, the World Methodist Conference, and the General Conference of the Methodist Church.

Harris has been affiliated with the International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist" – "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York"); and the Southern Conference Educational Fund, financial backbone of racial agitators, including the "black power" revolutionaries.

EDLER HAWKINS was born on June 13, 1908 in New York City, son of Annie Lee and Albert Hawkins. He married Thelma Burnett. He is an alumnus of Bloomfield College (B.A., 1935) and Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1938). In 1938, he was ordained as a Presbyterian minister.

Since 1938 (with the exception of one year), Hawkins has been pastor of St. Augustine's Presbyterian Church in the Bronx. From 1958 until 1960, he was moderator of the Presbytery of New York. In 1960 and 1961, he was vice moderator of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church. In 1964 and 1965, he was moderator of the General Assembly.

Hawkins has repudiated any identification of himself with Communist ideology. He has stated that he has never been inclined in the slightest way toward Communism.

In 1941, Hawkins was affiliated with the Bronx Anti-Poll Tax Committee ("Communist front"). In 1943, he was affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"). In 1944, he was affiliated with the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York"). In 1945, he was affiliated with the Committee for Equal Justice for Mrs. Recy Taylor, an auxiliary of International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"). In 1946, he was a sponsor of the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"). In 1947, he signed an open letter to President Harry S. Truman. The letter appeared in the Communists' *People's World* and read, in part: "We, the undersigned Negro Americans, respectfully urge you to repudiate the fascist like proposal of Labor Secretary Lewis B. Schwellenbach to illegalize the Communist Party." In 1948, he was vice chairman of the American Labor Party and a candidate for New York's State Assembly on the ALP ticket. ("Communist dissimulation extends into the field of political parties forming political front organizations such as the . . . American Labor Party. The Communists are thus enabled to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label.") In 1950, he supported W.E.B. DuBois, an old Communist wheelhorse, as a candidate for the U.S. Senate on the ALP ticket.

In 1949, Hawkins was affiliated with the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the World Peace Congress ("Communist front"); and the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace ("Communist front"). In 1955, he was affiliated with the Religious Freedom Committee (to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities), an affiliate of the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front").

In 1964, the year in which Hawkins became the "unofficial ambassador and spokesman of the United Presbyterian Church," the Communists' *Worker* – in a front-page story – hailed the Metropolitan Conference of Civil Rights Action, of which Hawkins was chairman. The Metropolitan Conference was a "massive organizational effort" to persuade New York City Congressmen to support the racist-agitating Mississippi Freedom Party's challenge of the legitimate Mississippi delegation to Congress.

Hawkins justified the 1963 Negro riots "as the means of a final appeal to redress the ancient wrongs of discrimination and segregation." He has charged that "most white folks" are born with racial practices that take on the character of religious sanction. And he has written that Americans are "under a responsibility to say that our world will have the scent of slow death upon it, if we do not recognize that to be a Negro in America today one must continually mount an attack on things that white Americans hold sacred but which keep Negro Americans outside of the spiritual affinity which members of the human family must share with each other."

STERLING HAYDEN was born Sterling Relyea Walter (James W. Hayden was his stepfather) on March 26, 1916 in Montclair, New Jersey. He has been married three times and divorced twice. He left high school in the middle of his sophomore year.

From 1932 until 1937, Hayden was a shipyard worker and a seaman. In 1937, he received his master's license and during the next few years he commanded ships on lengthy commercial voyages. In 1940 and 1941, he was an actor in Hollywood motion pictures. In 1941, he trained for about three months to serve as a commando for the Coordinator of Information (which later became the Office of Strategic Services). He was injured during the training period, and for a few months, in 1942, he worked in a New Jersey shipyard. In the summer of 1942, he hauled freight in a schooner for the War Shipping Administration.

In October 1942, Hayden enlisted in the U.S. Marines and was selected for work in the Office of Strategic Services. (At about this time he changed his name legally to "John Hamilton," but in later years he used "Sterling Hayden" for public identification.) From December 1942 until November 1944, he was based in Italy, working with Communist partisans from Yugoslavia. In 1945, he served with the OSS in Belgium, France, and Germany. He was discharged from the service in December 1945.

In 1946, Hayden returned to Hollywood. In June 1946, he was recruited into the Communist Party by Bea Winters, a secretary in the office of Hayden's business agent. During the next six months, Hayden was a dues-paying member of a Communist cell and attended cell meetings regularly.

In July 1950, Hayden's attorney wrote to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that Hayden was willing to submit to any interrogation or examination by the FBI in order to obtain an FBI "clearance" for prospective employment either in the armed forces or elsewhere. Mr. Hoover advised that the FBI did not grant "clearances," but suggested that Hayden furnish FBI agents with details concerning his membership in the Communist Party.

Hayden was interviewed by FBI agents, and on April 10, 1951, he testified for more than three hours before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The transcript of Hayden's testimony before the HCUA indicates – on the surface, at least – that he sincerely wished to cooperate with the committee by telling of his associations with the Communist Party and of his complete and irrevocable break with any group tainted by Communism.

In later years, Hayden expressed regret that he had ever appeared before the HCUA. He did so in the autobiographical *Wanderer,* published by Knopf in 1963. He did it in a lengthy interview in *Counterpoint,* which was compiled and edited by Roy Newquist and published in 1964. He did it again during a press conference in 1964, while he was attending a rally of the Communist-front National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Hayden's *Wanderer* was dedicated to Warwick Tompkins and Rockwell Kent. (Tompkins was a Communist with whom Hayden had been acqauinted since 1930. Kent was one of America's better known fellow travelers. In 1967, after donating $10,000 to the North Vietnamese government, Kent was awarded the Lenin "Peace" Prize for his opposition to United States participation in the Vietnam War.) And *Wanderer* was edited by Angus Cameron, described by Hayden as "a wonderful man." (Cameron had had his own experiences before a Congressional committee. In 1951, he had been identified under oath as a Communist. In 1951 and 1953, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee gave him the opportunity to deny the identification, but he pleaded his right to remain silent under the protection of the First, Fifth, and Ninth Amendments to the Constitution of the United States. Then, in 1955, Cameron wreaked vengeance on Congressional investigation committees. As head of the firm Cameron and Kahn, he published Harvey Matusow's *False Wit-*

ness. Matusow had testified before the HCUA and the SISS on Communist Party activities. The Communist Party, however, decided to have Matusow recant his testimony and discredit the HCUA and the SISS through *False Witness.* The book was prepared under the direction of two Communists, Albert Kahn and Nathan Witt. It was financed by Communists, distributed through Communist-controlled unions, and publicized in the Communist press throughout the United States and Europe. In 1959, Cameron, the publisher of *False Witness,* became an editor for Knopf, where he helped Hayden attack the HCUA and decry his "stool-pigeon" testimony through *Wanderer.*)

At the 1964 rally of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, Hayden completed his recantation of his 1951 appearance before the HCUA: "Hayden told the press before the rally that HUAC went into Hollywood in 1951 and 'harassed talented men, sent them into exile abroad and practically destroyed the Hollywood film industry.'

"He said that the blacklist HUAC caused still exists today.

"He had been involved in those hearings, Hayden reported.

" 'I did something I am not very proud of today,' he said. 'On the advice of my attorneys, I told the FBI that I was a former Communist, for six months in 1946, when I was making $32,000 a week under contract to Paramount.'

"He said that HUAC 'staged' a hearing for him, at which they 'lauded me as a super patriot for naming names, for destroying people.'

"Hayden said that 'HUAC must go' if gains are to be made in the civil rights and other freedom movements." (See *The Worker,* May 5, 1964, page 3.)

In the 1964 *Counterpoint* interview, Hayden said: "After the war I went back into pictures but, by this time, I was conscious of what I felt was the struggle for social justice. This was a result of what I had seen in Yugoslavia. I had also been exposed to a man in San Francisco, allegedly a member of the Communist party, who started me reading and thinking about socialism. I joined the Party and got out of it in six months. I was never in it, actually. I'm not excusing myself at all – I don't feel I have to. Curiously, I feel more radical in my beliefs today than I did when I was a member of the Party. This poses a question in view of the witch-hunt affair: Is it a Party, or is it the presence of injustice, which presents the real problem?"

The "witch-hunt affair" was evidently a reference to his appearance before the HCUA in 1951. But Hayden's utterances in the 1960's present a curious contrast to that appearance and the circumstances surrounding it.

In 1950, Hayden was a man frightened by his own past and apprehensive of the future. He was definitely not a victim of a "witch-hunt." In the letter from Hayden's attorney, Martin Gang, to J. Edgar Hoover on July 31, 1950, Hayden appeared as a man seeking protection from the federal government: "This office has a client who has discussed with us a problem which I believe can only be answered through your organization.

"In June of 1946 this young man [Hayden], in a moment of emotional disturbance, became a bona fide member of the Communist Party in the State of California. In November of 1946 he decided that he had made a mistake and terminated his membership and his association with the Communist Party. Ever since November of 1946 this client has had no connection whatsoever with the Communist Party or with an organization affiliated with it . . . .

"Our client is not engaged in any activity where security is involved. However, since the commencement of the operation in Korea, he has felt that the time may come, in the near future, when his services might be of aid to the United States. He is concerned with the fact that his brief membership in the Communist Party, as aforesaid, may operate to prevent the use of his services.

"In addition to the foregoing, he is married and has young children. If his services are not needed by the United States, conditions may develop so as to require an answer in connection with ordinary employment to the query: 'Are you now or have you ever been a Communist?'

"Our client can, of course, answer honestly and frankly that he is not now a member of the Communist Party. He could not answer the rest of the compound question without (a) either lying, or (b) if he told the truth he would probably find himself unable to earn a living.

"While it must be admitted that a mistake was made in 1946, it does appear that justice requires some method by which one mistake does not operate (a) to prevent the United States from making use of the services of our client, (b) to prevent our client from earning a living."

In 1964, Hayden complained that, in 1951, the HCUA went into Hollywood and "harassed talented men." But during the course of his sworn testimony in 1951, Hayden was asked: "What is your opinion of the jurisdiction, the purpose, the functioning of this committee? . . . Is it, in your judgment, serving a useful purpose? Is it serving a necessary purpose? If so, to what extent, and if not, why? . . . If you have any criticism of the manner in which this committee functions, I would like to know what that criticism is." Hayden replied: "I think of no criticism whatever." And, in another part of his sworn testimony, Hayden said, without prompting by the Committee: "I would like to say that I appreciate very much, very, very much, the opportunity to appear here today. I think that there is a tremendous service to be rendered, not only to the country at large but to the motion-picture industry and also to those individuals who find themselves in a similar position to mine. I have heard that there are many, many thousands – I have heard there are hundreds of thousands – of ex-Communists who don't know what to do about it. I would like, if it is not presumptuous, to suggest in all humility that perhaps some provision could be made by law to permit people who had had a similar experience to make their position known and clear, so that they could get this thing off their chest, because, believe me, it is a load to carry around with you."

In the 1964 *Counterpoint* interview, Hayden said that he was never actually in the Communist Party and, even though he had joined it, his brief flirtation with it was traceable to his concern for social justice (a result of his Yugoslav experiences) and the reading and thinking about "socialism" inspired by "a man in San Francisco, allegedly a member of the Communist party."

In the course of his sworn testimony, Hayden never approached coherency when he tried to explain how his experiences in Yugoslavia caused him to work for social justice. But he was quite voluble about the "man in San Francisco."

Hayden testified that he had known Warwick Tompkins – the "man in San Francisco" – since 1930. After a lapse of some years, he said, he had resumed his acquaintanceship with Tompkins in 1940. In his testimony, Hayden characterized Tompkins in unequivocal terms: "He at that time [1940], or previously, had become, I believe, an open and avowed Communist. He made no bones about it. He talked about very little else, and he started to deluge me with propaganda." During World War II, while Hayden was overseas, he had extensive correspondence with Tompkins, who continued to ply him with Communist propaganda; and in 1944, when Hayden was furloughed to the United States, the first thing he did was to visit Tompkins in California. There Hayden was lionized by Communist functionaries as Tompkins introduced him to his comrades. From California, Hayden continued his furlough in New York where, through the influence of Tompkins, he met Communist functionaries Joe North and V.J. Jerome. Later, in 1946, after his release from the service, Hayden spent six weeks with Tompkins. Bea Winters, who recruited Hayden in that year, was prompted to do so by Tompkins.

In his overture to the FBI, in the testimony he gave to the HCUA, and in the *Counterpoint* interview, Hayden always appeared anxious to give the impression that he joined the Communist Party on a sudden impulse. ("I joined the Party and got out of it in six months. I was never in it, actually." – *Counterpoint.* "I went into the thing voluntarily. I think it was the stupidest, most ignorant thing I have ever done, and I have done a good many such things, but I did go into it with a very emotional and very unsound approach." – *Testimony before HCUA.* "This young man, in a moment of emotional disturbance, became a bona fide member of the Communist Party." – *Hayden's lawyer to J. Edgar Hoover.*) The truth is, however, that Hayden had been primed for at least six years to join the Communist Party by his Communist guru Tompkins and by Communist functionaries in California and New York.

Hayden's autobiography *Wanderer,* a selection of the Literary Guild's book club, is a curious document. It is extremely difficult to estimate how much of it is fact and how much fiction. But there can be no doubt that the book grossly distorts Hayden's experiences with the FBI and the HCUA. In *Wanderer,* Hayden represents the exchange of letters between his attorney and J. Edgar Hoover as having taken place on May 16 and May 23, 1950 – which he says was after the Korean War broke out. But the war did not break out until June 25, 1950. Hayden recalls Gordon Scherer as being a member of the HCUA on April 10, 1951, when Hayden testified. But Scherer did not enter Congress until January 3, 1953. Hayden quotes himself and Congressman Morgan Moulder incorrectly. And in an amazing display of arrogance, he quotes the late Congressman Francis Walter as having said: "I think that by this courageous and forthright testimony today this witness [Hayden] has set an example that thousands of others might follow." Mr. Walter said no such thing.

Hayden's appearance before the HCUA certainly did not retard his Hollywood career. In rapid succession, during what he described as "the dismal years of the black list," he completed motion pictures at the rate of five or six a year. But Hayden did have difficulties in the 1950's, many of which he blamed upon advice he was receiving from psychoanalysts. During these years he had marital problems that led to divorce and litigation for custodial rights to his children. In contempt of court, Hayden in 1959 took his four children aboard a schooner on a South Seas venture that lasted for eleven months. He gained custody of the children, but was fined $500 and given a five-day suspended sentence on the contempt charges.

In 1959, Hayden voluntarily gave up his acting career. By 1963, Hayden had become a veteran participant in leftwing-pacifist demonstrations. He had joined the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, a Communist-front. He was a member of Mark Lane's Citizens Committee on Inquiry to clear Lee Harvey Oswald of blame in the assassination of John F. Kennedy. In that year, 1963, he returned to motion pictures in *Dr. Strangelove, or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb.* In *Counterpoint* he said (pages 337-338): "[Stanley Kubrick, the producer] said that it was a picture that would deal with the cold war situation and the threat of nuclear holocaust. It would treat the business as a nightmare comedy . . . and he thought there was a role I could handle: the part of a psychotic SAC general . . . who, for reasons of his own, would trigger World War III . . . . I would have done the picture for nothing, and almost did, but I got a good deal in a fine film."

Since *Dr. Strangelove,* Hayden has more or less disappeared from the public scene. In 1965, however, he did emerge from obscurity on the French Riviera, where he was organizing American expatriates to rally against United States participation in the Vietnam War. And on April 15, 1968, United Press carried the following item: "Los Angeles: Actor Sterling Hayden's son Christian, 19, Malibu, Calif., has been indicted by a federal grand jury on charges of draft dodging, the U.S. Attorney's office disclosed Monday." On December 15, 1969, Christian – long-haired, bearded, and moustached – was sentenced to three and one-half years in prison for draft law violations. He acted as his own attorney.

THOMAS E. HAYDEN was born on December 11, 1939 in Detroit, Michigan. He married Sandra Cason. (They separated after two years.) He is an alumnus of the University of Michigan (A.B., 1961). From 1962 until 1964, he was an instructor and pursued graduate studies in sociology at Michigan.

During his collegiate days, Hayden became a campus militant. One of his first contacts with the radical left came when he visited the Berkeley campus of the University of California, where he conferred with leaders of the 1960 San Francisco riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In 1960, he became involved with the leftist Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (Snick) in Atlanta and Tennessee.

In December 1961, at Ann Arbor, Michigan, Hayden attended a meeting of about thirty-five activists, many of whom were members of the student arm of the socialist League for Industrial Democracy. The group delegated Hayden to write a manifesto for Students for a Democratic Society (a name which the Student League for Industrial Democracy had recently adopted). The manifesto, with some amendments, became the Port Huron Statement of June 1962 when SDS – purportedly independent of the League for Industrial Democracy – was established. (In fact, the parent LID continued to give its financial support and approval to SDS and, in turn, SDS did not disavow the LID, which had been founded in 1905.)

Hayden's Port Huron Statement was a dull, rambling, high-flown discourse which, in its essentials, was a call for a Marxian-Socialist state to be achieved through "participatory democracy" ("to organize people so they could have some control over their lives"), a euphemism for Communism. Hayden and those who collaborated with him in writing the Statement found virtually nothing of any worth in the United States. Their dismal heritage, according to their allegations, was the "cold" war, The Bomb, McCarthyism, racial bigotry, the military-industrial complex, automation, poverty, colonialism, paranoiac anti-Communism, and just about any other alleged ill that could be found in the history of socialist/Communist protests. They were discontented with the status of political parties, the national economy, organized labor, universities, foreign "aid" programs, and mental health programs. They would work for civil rights, especially by supporting the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. They would participate in activity for peace and disarmament. They would dramatize economic injustices. They would "inject controversy into a stagnant educational system." They would work against paternalistic deans, lobby for student freedom, stimulate the creation of new or improved courses on peace-related and economic problems, and support political insurgents in the fight for a government that would promote social justice.

(The implementation of Hayden's Port Huron Statement placed the SDS squarely on the far left. On February 16, 1967, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified that the SDS was working "constantly in furtherance of the aims and objectives of the Communist Party throughout the Nation." On February 23, 1968, Mr. Hoover testified further: "The new left student movement in this country . . . is many-sided. It is political theory, sociology, and bitter protest. It is linked with civil rights, the fight against poverty, the American war in Vietnam. It involves students, faculty members, writers, intellectuals, beatniks, most of them being quite young. The mood of this movement, which is best typified by its primary spokesman, the Students for a Democratic Society, is a mood of disillusionment, pessimism, and alienation. At the center of the movement is an almost passionate desire to destroy, to annihilate, to tear down. If anything definite can be said about the Students for a Democratic Society, it is that it can be called anarchistic." On April 17, 1969, before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations, Mr. Hoover testified: "The Students for a Democratic Society advocates, in the terminology of a considerable number of its leaders and members, revolutionary communism.")

While a graduate student at Michigan, Hayden found time to serve as a field secretary for the SDS. Later, he was president of the group, and it is reasonable to assume that he has retained his ties with SDS up to the present time. (From 1960 onwards, Hayden could be accurately characterized as a professional revolutionary. He marched under the banners of racial integration; black power; ban-the-bomb; end-the-war; resist-the-draft; reform-the-university; reform-the-corporation; reform-the-local-government. He became deeply involved with Communists and Communism and pro-Communist enterprises. In 1965, he was an honored guest at the Communists' *National Guardian* annual dinner. In 1966, he participated in the *National Guardian's* forum on politics and policy.

In 1966, he sponsored the congressional campaign of Communist Party leader Herbert Aptheker. In 1967, he became an associate editor of David Dellinger's *Liberation* magazine, an important outlet for Communist propaganda. He has also been involved in Dellinger's National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which has been saturated with Communists and fellow travelers. In 1968, he went with Dellinger to Communist Cuba, by way of Mexico, to attend an International Cultural Congress in Havana. It was a gathering of Communists and other revolutionaries. In 1967, he traveled to Puerto Rico, where he lectured and took part in an anti-United States demonstration. His trip was sponsored by the Tri-Continental Information Center, a Communist-financed outfit. In 1967, he became a member of the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, working on behalf of three who evaded service in Vietnam.

In 1964, Hayden received $5,000 from Walter Reuther's United Automobile Workers "to start an experimental project in northern community organizing – the Economic Research and Action Project." Hayden established his base of operations in the Clinton Hill section of Newark, New Jersey. (Other SDS'ers went to Cleveland, Chicago, and Boston.)

In Newark, Hayden organized the Newark Community Union Project (NCUP), which was nothing less than a front for Students for a Democratic Society and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Hayden's NCUP succeeded in gaining a large measure of control over Newark's anti-poverty agency, the United Community Corporation, which was a conduit for funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity. (The OEO, Lyndon Johnson's "war on poverty" gimmick, had many of Hayden's aides on its payroll.) For several years, Hayden applied his "participatory democracy" in Newark by exploiting grievances between blacks and whites, exploiting every arrest made in a slum area, and demonstrating and applying pressure against various city officials, store owners, and property owners. Eventually, in July 1967, Newark exploded with five days of riots, during which twenty-one were killed. The rioting produced at least $10,000,000 damage. Many businesses were forced to shut down temporarily or permanently. More than 700 law officers and civilians were injured in an orgy of sniping, looting, and vandalism. More than 1400 arrests were made. And it all began with the arrest of a Negro cab driver for a traffic violation. (Captain Charles Kinney of the Newark Police Department, in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations, said that Hayden "was a very, very potent factor in causing the climate that engendered the riots in Newark in July 1967." Other Newark authorities corroborated Kinney's judgment.)

From 1964 until he left Newark in 1968, Hayden was also busy in other areas. In 1965, he traveled to Brussels, Prague, Moscow, Peking, and Hanoi. Accompanied by Communist leader Herbert Aptheker and ultra-leftist Staughton Lynd, Hayden – during a two-week stay – conferred in Hanoi with Communist leaders, and upon his return to the United States he devoted a great deal of time to propagandizing for the North Vietnamese. He wrote a foreword to Aptheker's *Mission to Hanoi* and collaborated with Lynd on *The Other Side.* Both works were totally sympathetic to North Vietnam's war of aggression.

After his return from Hanoi, in an

interview with Charlotte A. Wotter of the [University of] *Michigan Daily*, January 12, 1966, Hayden showed how much he was committed to the cause of Communist North Vietnam. He told Miss Wotter that he had been particularly impressed by the difference between the political worlds of the United States and North Vietnam. In a spectacular display of rewritten history and patent absurdities, he said: "The difference came because it [North Vietnam] was an agricultural country where 20 years ago most people were starving and could not even use the alphabet, that it has been at war for 25 years and has been torn apart by other countries and divided so that the political thinking is at the most basic level. For example, peace means the end of 25 years of fighting on their own soil, independence means keeping Vietnamese in control of Viet Nam and everyone goes to school and has food, and reunification means bringing together families and relatives that were divided by the Geneva Agreement. After they were [*sic*] able to obtain a peace settlement, the NLF [National Liberation Front] would form a broad coalition on a temporary basis to include groups who were patriotic, who put Viet Nam first. This would include middle class, working class, peasants, religious groups and political parties.

"They would then hold free elections for a national assembly which would then elect the president and several other officials. Their program would be one of basic economic and social reform, but would not go as far as socialism [!]."

From what he described as "very frank political discussions with the Communist leaders, Hayden learned that North Vietnam's future foreign policy was going to be neutralist. Normal travel and communications would be resumed between North and South Vietnam. Hayden was assured by Premier Pham Van Dong that North Vietnamese forces were not in South Vietnam and "I see little reason for him to make such a statement if it can be proven false by the U.S."

In 1967, Hayden – during a five-month period – was an instructor in political science at the Newark campus of Rutgers University. In the fall of 1967, North Vietnamese leaders offered to help Hayden and his revolutionary comrade, Dave Dellinger, organize a conference in Bratislava, Czecho-Slovakia. Hayden and Dellinger brought about forty American radicals to meet with their North Vietnamese counterparts in Bratislava. Out of the meeting developed a propaganda coup for the Communists with the connivance of Hayden and Dellinger.

When the Bratislava conference was concluded, Hayden flew to Hanoi and Cambodia. He was told by North Vietnamese authorities that three U.S. Army sergeants were to be released from captivity. Hayden went to Paris and, in November 1967, received instructions from the Communists to return to Cambodia. He did so and the three American prisoners were released in his custody. Hayden then placed the three Americans aboard a Czech airliner and they returned to the United States by way of Beirut, Lebanon.

The year 1968 was an extremely busy one for Hayden. In January, he journeyed to Communist Cuba. In April and May, he was in the midst of the SDS leadership in the riots that thoroughly disrupted the campus of Columbia University. In June, he appeared as an honor guard at Senator Robert Kennedy's wake in St. Patrick's Cathedral. In July, he became the national coordinator for the presidential candidacy of Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver, who became a fugitive from justice in December. Also in July, Hayden traveled to Paris where he met with North Vietnamese authorities. At the time, Hayden was in the midst of preparations to disrupt the proceedings of the Democratic National Convention that was to be held at Chicago in August. Hayden explained that the North Vietnamese "are always very interested in demonstrations or activities in the United States against the war, although they believe that the reason there is a peace movement is because the United States has been defeated in Vietnam . . . [and] they are pleased at any kind of peace activity or any sign that people are beginning to come to their senses about Vietnam. So, of course, they are pleased about whatever the antiwar movement is trying to do in the United States – including demonstrations at the convention, including resistance to the draft, including traveling and speaking around the country on college campuses. Whatever we do for peace in Vietnam that we think is in our interest is obviously in their interest, because they want peace in Vietnam." (While in Paris, Hayden held extensive discussions with Averell Harriman, who was then the top American negotiator at the Paris "peace" talks.)

Hayden's role in the Chicago demonstrations was that of co-project director, with Rennie Davis, of the National Mobilization Committee. (Hayden and Davis were appointed by David Dellinger, Mobe's chairman. Mobe was the dominant coordinating force of groups that included Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panther Party, the Communist Party, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Youth International Party [Yippies].) The preparations for the Chicago demonstrations began as early as January 1968. Hayden was involved in the preparations and, from June until the conclusion of the convention in late August, he was in Chicago at Mobe's headquarters most of the time. He was directly involved in the actual demonstrations and, on one occasion, he harangued a mob in Grant Park: "This city [Chicago] and the military machinery it has aimed at us won't permit us to protest in an organized fashion. Therefore we must move out of this park in groups throughout the city and turn this overheated military machine against itself. Let us make sure that if blood flows, it flows all over the city; if they use gas against us, let's make sure they use gas against their own citizens."

In his summary of the Chicago demonstrations, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said: "Demonstrations held during the convention period included taunting of the police: they were referred to as 'pigs,' they were spat upon, obscenities were shouted at them and they were the targets of all kinds of unbelievable abuse; on several occasions undisciplined mobs intent on marching to the convention site without legal authority had to be repulsed by the police and National Guard. Reportedly many of the hippies used drugs regularly.

"The demonstrations resulted in mass arrests. Also, there were numerous police and demonstrators injured. Approximately 650 arrests were made by local authorities and nearly 200 police officers were injured during the confrontations with the demonstrators. It has been estimated that more than 900 persons obtained emergency treatment for injuries received during the disorder." (Dellinger had promised, "We will make our presence dramatically and militantly felt.")

On March 20, 1969, Hayden and

seven of his cohorts were indicted by a federal grand jury at Chicago. Among the counts charged against Hayden was "that during the period beginning on or about July 20, 1968 through on or about August 22, 1968, Thomas E. Hayden . . . did travel in interstate commerce from outside the State of Illinois to Chicago, Illinois . . . with intent to incite, organize, promote and encourage a riot and, thereafter, on or about August 26, 1968, at Grant Park, Chicago, Illinois, he did speak to an assemblage of persons for the purpose of inciting, organizing, promoting and encouraging a riot."

Hayden and his co-defendants decided to call themselves "The Conspiracy," and invited others "to join a conspiracy of people against the forces that brought us Vietnam, the ABM, racism, high taxes, unemployment, hunger, political machines and a corporate system that exalts private profit and property over human needs." (A "Committee to Defend the Conspiracy" was immediately formed to solicit political and financial support for Hayden and his co-defendants. Rallying for "The Conspiracy" were the usual letterhead performers, along with some newcomers: Julian Bond, Leonard Bernstein, Noam Chomsky, Congressmen John Conyers Jr. and Don Edwards, Judy Collins, Harvey Cox, Ossie Davis and his wife Ruby Dee, Jules Feiffer, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Sidney Lens, Helen Lynd, Dwight MacDonald, Norman Mailer, Stewart Meacham, Marcus Raskin, Pete Seeger, Tom Smothers, Albert Szent-Györgyi, Benjamin Spock, I.F. Stone, Harold Taylor, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn.)

The trial of "The Conspiracy" began on September 24, 1969 in the federal district court of Chicago. Meanwhile, Hayden had left Chicago and gone to California. In January 1969, Hayden replaced Eldridge Cleaver (then a fugitive from justice) as a lecturer on the Berkeley campus of the University of California: his topic was "The New American Revolution." In March 1969, Hayden was hired to teach an experimental course (again, "The New American Revolution") at San José State College in California.

The "Conspiracy Trial" ended on February 18, 1970, when the jury found Hayden guilty of violating the anti-riot provision of the 1968 Civil Rights Act by crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. He was sentenced to five years' imprisonment, fined $5,000, and assessed for a share of the costs of prosecution. The presiding judge also found Hayden in contempt of court and sentenced him to one year, two months, and fourteen days in prison.

SAMUEL P. HAYES was born on January 28, 1910 in South Hadley, Massachusetts, son of Agnes Stone and Samuel Perkins. He married Alice Cable. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (A.B., 1931) and Yale University (Ph.D., 1934). He pursued post-doctoral studies at the University of Chicago in 1937 and 1938 while on a Social Science Research Council fellowship. He is the author of *Measuring the Results of Development Projects* (1959); *An International Peace Corps* (1961); and *Evaluating Development Projects* (1966).

From 1931 until 1934, Hayes was a psychology assistant at Yale University's Institute of Human Relations. From 1934 until 1937, he was a psychology instructor at Mt. Holyoke College. From 1938 until 1940, he was on the economics faculty at Saint Lawrence College. From 1940 until 1942, he was a market researcher for Young and Rubicam Inc. In 1942 and 1943, he was employed by the Office of Price Administration. From 1943 until 1945, he was employed in the Lend-Lease Program. In 1945, he was with the Foreign Economic Administration (foreign aid) in Oslo and Copenhagen. From 1945 until 1948, he was associate director for marketing and research at Dun and Bradstreet Inc. From 1948 until 1950, he was a special assistant to the assistant secretary for economic affairs in the Department of State. In 1950, he was deputy chief of an economic survey mission of the Department of State in Southeast Asia. In 1950 and 1951, he was director for program planning in the Technical Cooperation Administration (foreign aid) in the Department of State. In 1951 and 1952, he was chief of the Department of State's special economic and technical mission to Indonesia. In 1952 and 1953, he was director of the Far East programs of the Mutual Security Agency in the Department of State. From 1953 until 1960, he was director of the Foundation for Research on Human Behavior at Ann Arbor, Michigan. From 1955 until 1957, he lectured on economics at the University of Michigan. From 1959 until 1962, he was a professor of economics at the University of Michigan, and in 1961 and 1962, director of the University's Center for Research on Economic Development in Underdeveloped Areas.

From 1954 until 1959, Hayes was a consultant to the Communist-dominated UNESCO. In 1961, he was a consultant to the Agency for International Development (foreign aid). In 1961 and 1962, he was a consultant to the Peace Corps. From 1955 until 1960, he was a member of the advisory committee on political organization for the Democratic National Committee. He has been a consultant to the University of Kansas City and the University of Pittsburgh. From 1960 until 1964, he was an official of the leftist-internationalist Institute of International Education. In 1968, he was a senior specialist of the East-West Center of the University of Hawaii.

Since 1962, Hayes has been president of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda. He is a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He was affiliated with Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

HENRY T. HEALD was born on November 8, 1904 in Lincoln, Nebraska, son of Nellie Townley and Frederick Heald. He married Muriel Starcher. He is an alumnus of the State College of Washington (B.S., 1923) and the University of Illinois (M.S., 1925).

From 1923 until 1927, Heald worked as a civil engineer in Oregon and Illinois. From 1927 until 1940, he was at the Armour Institute of Technology in Illinois: as assistant professor of civil engineering (1927-1931); associate professor (1931-1934); professor (1934-1940); assistant dean (1931-1933); dean of freshmen (1933-1934); dean of the college (1934-1938); and president (1938-1940). From 1940 until 1952, he was president of the Illinois Institute of Technology. From 1941 until 1952, he was also president of the Armour Research Foundation and the Institute of Gas Technology. From 1940 until 1945, he was an advisor to the United States

Office of Education; from 1942 until 1949, an advisor to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; from 1942 until 1945, a consultant to the War Manpower Commission; from 1945 until 1949, an advisor to the United States Chemical Corps; and from 1949 until 1953, an advisor to the Department of Defense's Research and Development Board.

From 1952 until 1956, Heald was chancellor of New York University. From 1956 until 1965, he was president and trustee of the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation. Since 1965, he has been with Heald, Hobson & Associates, educational consultants, as partner until 1969, and since 1969, as chairman of the board. He is a director of Crowell, Collier and Macmillan Incorporated, Lever Brothers, the U.S. Steel Corporation, the Equitable Life Assurance Society, and the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

Heald is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is a member of the Foreign Policy Association, a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda.

HENRY HEINZ II was born on July 10, 1908 in Sewickley, Pennsylvania, son of Elizabeth Rust and Howard Heinz. He was married to and divorced from Joan Diehl. His second wife is Drue Maher. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1931). In 1931 and 1932, he pursued graduate studies at Trinity College in England.

Since 1932, Heinz has been associated with his family's enterprise, H.J. Heinz Company: as salesman (1933-1937); assistant to the president (1937-1941); president (1941-1959); and since 1959, chairman of the board.

Heinz has been a director of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council of the United States. He has been a long-time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations in the important work of socializing the American economy. He has been a member of the leftist-internationalist World Affairs Council of Pittsburgh.

LILLIAN HELLMAN was born on June 20, 1905 in New Orleans, daughter of Julia Newhouse and Max Hellman. She was married to and divorced from Arthur Kober. After her divorce from Kober, she lived for about thirty years with the late Dashiell Hammett, an author and a member of the Communist Party. She attended New York University and Columbia University for about three years.

In 1924 and 1925, Hellman was a manuscript writer for Liveright's publishing house. From 1925 until 1928, she was a book reviewer for the *New York Herald Tribune.* From 1927 until 1930, she was a free-lance theatrical play reader. From 1930 until 1932, she was a scenario reader for the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer film studios. She began a career as a playwright in 1933, and in 1935, a career as a scenario writer. Her most famous plays – many of which contain a political "message" – include: *The Children's Hour, The Little Foxes, Watch on the Rhine, Another Part of the Forest, Toys in the Attic,* and *The Searching Wind.* Several of her plays were adapted for motion pictures. She received the New York Critics Circle Award in 1941 (*Watch on the Rhine*) and in 1960 (*Toys in the Attic*). She has received honorary degrees from Tufts University (1950) and Wheaton College (1961). She was awarded the Brandeis University Creative Arts Medal in Theater for 1960 and 1961. In 1964, she received a medal for special distinction from the National Institute of Arts and Letters.

In 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee included Hellman's name in its list of the eighty-two most active and typical sponsors of Communist front organizations. In 1952, she testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities when it was investigating Communist infiltration of the Hollywood motion-picture industry.

Hellman joined the Communist Party in 1937. In her testimony before the HCUA, she said that she left the party around 1950. She refused, however, under the Fifth Amendment, to specify a date, and she would not answer questions about her associates in the party or the circumstances of her separation from the party.

In 1969, Little, Brown published Hellman's autobiography, *An Unfinished Woman.* When the publishers advertised the book, they wrote: "She lived through and was a part of this generation's most significant events: the Spanish Civil War, the siege of Leningrad, the McCarthy investigations. Her companions were the prime movers in the worlds of politics as well as literature: [Averell] Harriman and [Maksim] Litvinov, [Ernest] Hemingway and [F. Scott] Fitzgerald. The memories she has culled for us are vividly delineated, rich in anecdotes, entertaining in the sense of a wonderful play."

A reviewer for the *New York Times,* Stanley Young, perceived accurately that *An Unfinished Woman* was a "short and modest memoir" (he could have called it an apologia) which provides "limited clues to a lifetime of important creative productivity." In truth, Hellman was as reluctant to be candid in *An Unfinished Woman* as she had been in the HCUA hearings in 1952. Young, although an obvious admirer of Hellman, lamented her lack of candor as he wrote: "What appears to be a studied evasiveness about her theater life is matched by Miss Hellman's reluctance to shed any considerable light on her dramatic associations with liberal [*sic*] political causes, from the Spanish Civil War, through McCarthyism [*sic*] and her own appearance before the House Un-American Activities Committee, to the Hollywood blacklist and Vietnam. She touches in passing – and then only indirectly – on certain fellow-traveler sympathies of the thirties, on diary-recorded visits to Spain and Soviet Russia, but always it is the lively anecdote from her travels and encounters that implies the reason for her presence. Miss Hellman keeps intact the hidden channels of her own beliefs."

Hellman, of course, was much more than a "fellow-traveler" in the thirties. She was a member of the Communist Party at least until 1950. And her leftwing activities have continued down to the present time.

Over a span of three decades, Hellman's affiliations have included: Allied Voters against Coudert ("Communist front"); the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee to Save Refugees ("Communist enterprise"); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); Artists' Front to Win the War ("Communist front"); Citizens Committee for Harry Bridges ("Communist"); the Coordinating Committee to

Lift the [Spanish] Embargo ("Communist front"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); *Equality* magazine ("a Communist Party enterprise"); History Today (producing pro-Communist films); Frontier Films ("Communist front"); Films for Democracy ("Communist front"); Film Audiences for Democracy ("Communist front"); Friends of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade ("its officers and staff members were in the main [Communist] Party members and functionaries"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the League of American Writers ("subversive and Communist"); the New York League of Women Shoppers ("Communist front"); The Woman Shopper ("Communist front"); Artists' League of America ("Communist front"); the German-American Emergency Conference ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism ("Communist front"); the National Committee for People's Rights ("entirely under the control of the Communist Party"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Labor Party ("Communist political front"); the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee ("Communist front"); the North American Spanish Aid Committee ("Communist"); the Theatre Arts Committee ("Communist front"); the American Round Table on India ("Communist front"); the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – "a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and 'Soviet culture' "); the Non-Sectarian Committee for Political Refugees ("Communist front"); the Congress of American Women ("subversive and Communist"); the California Labor School ("a subversive and Communist organization"); the Voice of Freedom Committee (defending pro-Communist speakers on radio); *Soviet Russia Today* ("Communist front publication"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); and the American Council on Soviet Relations ("established by Communist Party"). She has displayed an especial affection for the Soviet Union, which she has visited frequently since the thirties. In recent years, she has followed the pro-Communist line on the Vietnam War.

In her *An Unfinished Woman,* Hellman concluded: "I never knew what I meant by truth, never made the sense I hoped for. All I mean is that I left too much of me unfinished because I wasted too much time. However."

NATHAN HENTOFF was born on June 10, 1925 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Lena Katzenberg and Simon Hentoff. He was married to and divorced from Miriam Sargent and Trudi Bernstein. He is married to Margot Goodman. He is an alumnus of Northeastern University (B.A., 1945). He pursued graduate studies at Harvard University and, in 1950, was a Fulbright fellow at the Sorbonne in Paris. He has lectured at Harvard University, Brandeis University, Boston University, Columbia University, the University of Connecticut, and the New School for Social Research.

From 1944 until 1953, Hentoff was a writer, producer, and announcer for radio station WMEX in Boston. In 1952 and 1953, he was an announcer and writer for the Lowell Institute's educational radio station WGBH-FM in Boston. From 1953 until 1957 he was an associate editor of *Down Beat* magazine, and during the same period was a musical advisor to CBS-TV. In 1958, he co-founded *The Jazz Review* and was a co-editor of that periodical for two years.

Hentoff is the editor or co-editor of *Jazz, The Jazz Makers, Hear Me Talkin' to Ya,* and *The Essays of A.J. Muste.* He is the author of *The Jazz Life, The New Equality, Call the Keeper, Jazz Country, Our Children Are Dying,* and *The Peace Agitator* – the latter a maudlin biographical tribute to Abraham J. Muste, one of the nation's all-time inveterate fellow travelers, whose support for the Communist Party and its fronts is legendary. Hentoff's writings have appeared in *The Reporter, Commonweal, Playboy, Village Voice, Peace News* (London, England), *New Yorker,* and *Evergreen Review.* He is now an associate editor of the leftwing, pacifist magazine, *Liberation.*

Besides being one of the nation's better known jazz critics, Hentoff has become extremely active in leftwing circles. In 1964, he told a *Newsweek* reporter: "From jazz, I inevitably became involved in the world that jazz itself reflects, and I therefore began to write about civil rights . . . . That naturally led to the problems of poverty – and ways to end it."

Hentoff, as a leftwing pacifist, has been affiliated with the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the Writers and Artists Protest against the Vietnam War in 1965, the Voters' Pledge Campaign for Peace Candidates in 1966, the Sing-in for Peace Concert at Carnegie Hall in 1966, the 1967 Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the War Resisters League, and the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee (on behalf of three who evaded service in Vietnam).

Hentoff has been affiliated with the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"). He has petitioned for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He is virulently critical of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, the late U.S. Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, and others whose anti-Communist activities were performed while in government service. He petitioned for clemency for Morton Sobell, a convicted and imprisoned atom spy. He protested, in 1961, against the anti-Castro invasion of Cuba.

Hentoff has belonged to the Alexander Defense Committee (on behalf of Red racial agitators in South Africa); the Monroe Defense Committee (on behalf of Robert F. Williams, the racist terrorist); the Charter Group for a Pledge of Conscience (on behalf of six Harlemites who conspired to murder a woman shopkeeper); and Defenders of 3 Against HUAC (on behalf of three leftwingers held in contempt of Congress).

In 1965, Hentoff endorsed the New York City mayoralty candidacy of the ultra-leftist William Fitts Ryan. In 1966, he participated in the National Conference for New Politics, a third party movement largely controlled by the Communist Party.

Hentoff is an activist member of the American Civil Liberties Union and is on the board of directors of the New York Civil Liberties Union. As a "civil libertarian" he is especially interested in the rights of campus revolutionaries, black militants, and draft resisters. He rails against school administrators and law enforcement officers who refuse to stand by while institutions and laws are torn asunder by "dissenters."

JOHN HERSEY was born on June 17, 1914 in Tientsin, China, son of Grace Baird and Roscoe Hersey (American citizens). He married, first, and was divorced from, Frances Cannon, and married, second, Barbara Kaufman. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1936). In 1936 and 1937, he pursued graduate studies at Clare College, Cambridge University, England.

Hersey is the author of *Men on Bataan* (1942), *Into the Valley: A Skirmish of the Marines* (1943), *A Bell for Adano* (1944), *Hiroshima* (1946), *The Wall* (1950), *The Marmot Drive* (1953), *A Single Pebble* (1956), *The War Lover* (1959), *The Child Buyer* (1960), *Here to Stay: Studies on Human Tenacity* (1963), *White Lotus* (1965), *Too Far to Walk* (1966), *Under the Eye of the Storm* (1967), and *The Algiers Motel Incident* (1968).

Briefly, during 1937, Hersey was private secretary to the late novelist Sinclair Lewis. Between 1937 and 1944, he was a writer, correspondent, and editor for *Time* magazine. In 1944 and 1945, he was a correspondent and editor for *Life* magazine. Since 1945, he has been a free-lance contributor to various magazines.

In public affairs, Hersey has been a leftwing activist. In 1952, he was chairman of the Connecticut Volunteers for Adlai Stevenson. In 1956, he was a member of Stevenson's campaign staff. Hersey's affiliations have included the Institute of Pacific Relations ("a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives" – "an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence"); Nation Associates ("pro-Soviet, pro-Communist"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); Indusco ("Communist controlled"); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); Associated Magazine Contributors ("the Communist influence is established through such news services"); United World Federalists (leftwing, one-world); the Freedom from Fear Committee ("Communist front"); the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the Hiroshima House Foundation (leftwing-pacifist); the Voters' Pledge Campaign for Peace Candidates (leftwing-pacifist); Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy (part of the Red China lobby); Writers and Artists Protest [against the Vietnam War] (leftwing-pacifist); the Committee to Defend the "Conspiracy" (on behalf of the Chicago Seven rioters); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility (the anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation).

CHRISTIAN HERTER JR. was born on January 29, 1919 in Brooklyn, New York, son of Mary Pratt and Christian Herter. He was married to and divorced from Suzanne Clery. He is married to Susan Senior. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (B.S., 1941; LL.B., 1948).

From 1948 until 1953, Herter practiced law in Massachusetts. From 1951 until 1953, he was a Representative in the Massachusetts legislature. In 1953 and 1954, he was an administrative assistant to Vice President Richard Nixon. From 1954 until 1956, he was with the Department of State as general counsel to the Foreign Operations Administration and a member of the Department's policy-planning staff. In 1957 and 1958, he was a Governor's Councillor in Massachusetts. In 1958, he was an unsuccessful Republican candidate for Attorney General of Massachusetts. In 1961, he became general manager of the government relations department of the Mobil Oil Corporation, and in 1967, vice president of Mobil. In 1970, Secretary of State William P. Rogers appointed Herter as his special assistant for Environmental Affairs and director of the newly-created Office of Environmental Affairs in the Bureau of International, Scientific and Technological Affairs. (The State Department press release said: "Mr. Herter will provide leadership in marshalling governmental and private resources in support of international initiatives to meet and manage the environmental crisis. In this capacity, Mr. Herter will represent the United States in international organizations.")

Herter has been an influential figure in Eastern Establishment liberal circles. He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been president of the World Affairs Council of Boston, a major propaganda agency for the United Nations and one-worldism. He has been a director of the Foreign Policy Association, which has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism and has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists.

HUDSON HOAGLAND was born on December 5, 1899 in Rockaway, New Jersey, son of Ella Baylis and Mahlon Hoagland. He married Anna Plummer. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1921), Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.S., 1924), and Harvard University (Ph.D., 1927).

In 1927 and 1928, Hoagland held a National Research Council fellowship at Harvard University. From 1928 until 1930, he was a physiology instructor and biology tutor at Harvard. In 1930 and 1931, he was a fellow and special lecturer at Cambridge University in England. From 1931 until 1944, he was a professor of general physiology and director of the physiology laboratories at Clark University. In 1940 and 1941, he was a research associate in physiology at Harvard Medical School and a tutor in the bio-chemical sciences at Harvard University. In 1945 and 1946, he was a visiting lecturer in physiological psychology at Harvard University. From 1946 until 1950, he was a research professor in physiology at Tufts Medical School. Since 1950, he has been a research professor in physiology at Boston University. In 1944, while on a Guggenheim fellowship, he was a co-founder of the Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, which he served as executive director from 1944 until 1967 and as president in 1967 and 1968.

Hoagland has been affiliated with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"). He has joined in petitions to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been a national officer of the United World Federalists, an anti-American sovereignty group. He has been a very active member of the Federation of American Scientists, a bleeding-heart group, members of which are generally affiliated with a variety of radical one-world and/or pacifist organizations.

Hoagland's ultra-pacifism has been expressed through his affiliation with the ultra-leftist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; with the Church Peace Mission which calls for peaceful resistance to Communism and for unilateral disarmament by the United States; and with the peacenik, leftist Congress of Scientists on Survival, the Boston Area Faculty Group on Public Issues, and Political Action for Peace. Hoagland was also affiliated with Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

ABBOTT (ABBIE) HOFFMAN was born on November 30, 1936 in Worcester, Massachusetts, son of Florence and John Hoffman. His second wife is Anita Kushner. He is an alumnus of Brandeis University (B.A., 1959). In 1960, he pursued graduate studies at the University of California (Berkeley).

In the mid-1960's, Hoffman emerged on the national scene as a campus and off-campus revolutionary. He worked with such radical-leftist groups as Students for a Democratic Society, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality, and the Mississippi Freedom Party. He participated in campus demonstrations at the University of California (Berkeley). He led demonstrations against the Pentagon, against alleged police brutality, and against the Establishment in general. In 1968, he was a leader in the highly destructive riots at Columbia University, and in the same year he founded the Youth International Party (Yippies), composed mostly of campus misfits.

In 1968, at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Hoffman organized what he called the "Festival of Life." The "Festival" was actually a part of the disruptive demonstrations that made a shambles of the convention's proceedings. In his summary of the Chicago demonstrations, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said: "Demonstrations held during the convention period included taunting of the police: they were referred to as 'pigs,' they were spat upon, obscenities were shouted at them and they were the targets of all kinds of unbelievable abuse; on several occasions undisciplined mobs intent on marching to the convention site without legal authority had to be repulsed by the police and National Guard. Reportedly many of the hippies used drugs regularly.

"The demonstrations resulted in mass arrests. Also, there were numerous police and demonstrators injured. Approximately 650 arrests were made by local authorities and nearly 200 police officers were injured during the confrontations with the demonstrators. It has been estimated that more than 900 persons obtained emergency treatment for injuries received during the disorder."

On March 20, 1969, Hoffman and seven of his cohorts were indicted by a federal grand jury at Chicago. Among the counts charged against Hoffman was "that during the period beginning on or about July 20, 1968 through on or about August 22, 1968, Abbie Hoffman . . . did travel in interstate commerce from outside the State of Illinois to Chicago, Illinois . . . with intent to incite, organize, promote and encourage a riot and, thereafter, on or about August 28, 1968, at Grant Park, Chicago, Illinois, he did speak to an assemblage of persons for the purpose of inciting, organizing, promoting and encouraging a riot."

Hoffman and his co-defendants decided to call themselves "The Conspiracy," and invited others "to join a conspiracy of people against the forces that brought us Vietnam, the ABM, racism, high taxes, unemployment, hunger, political machines and a corporate system that exalts private profit and property over human needs." (A "Committee to Defend the Conspiracy" was immediately formed to solicit political and financial support for Hoffman and his co-defendants. Rallying for "The Conspiracy" were the usual letterhead performers, along with some newcomers: Julian Bond, Leonard Bernstein, Noam Chomsky, Congressmen John Conyers Jr. and Don Edwards, Judy Collins, Harvey Cox, Ossie Davis and his wife Ruby Dee, Jules Feiffer, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Sidney Lens, Helen Lynd, Dwight MacDonald, Norman Mailer, Stewart Meacham, Marcus Raskin, Pete Seeger, Tom Smothers, Albert Szent-Györgyi, Benjamin Spock, I.F. Stone, Harold Taylor, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn.)

The trial of "The Conspiracy" began on September 24, 1969, in the federal district court of Chicago. Hoffman and his fellow defendants, using a variety of schemes, made a mockery of the trial, the courtroom, the prosecution, and the presiding judge. Through constant interruptions, especially by name-calling, they created daily disturbances during which Hoffman was especially obnoxious toward his favorite target and namesake, Judge Julius Hoffman, whose Jewish origins and religion came under the scorn of Abbie Hoffman, born a Jew but proclaiming his religion to be "neo-American."

"The Conspiracy Trial" ended on February 18, 1970, when the jury found Hoffman guilty of violating the anti-riot provision of the 1968 Civil Rights Act by crossing state lines with the intent to incite a riot. He was sentenced to five years' imprisonment, fined $5,000, and assessed for a share of the costs of prosecution. The presiding judge also found Hoffman in contempt of court and sentenced him to eight months in prison.

Hoffman and the other conspirators successfully delayed their imprisonment through appellate processes. Hoffman then began a career of public speeches – on radio, on television, in public forums, and on college campuses – in which his main theme was: "I think kids should kill their parents."

Hoffman has also enjoyed a writing career. His writings are vulgar, scatological, obscene, blasphemous, self-centered, incoherent, rambling, exhibitionistic, and prurient. He has contributed articles to so-called underground publications: *East Village Other, Eye, The Realist, Los Angeles Free Press,* and *Village Voice.* He has written three published books. The first was entitled with an obscenity and was privately printed. The other two were *Revolution for the Hell of It* and *Woodstock Nation.* Reviewing these two in the *New York Times* (July 12, 1970), Bennett Kremen wrote: " . . . We are given in both his books more egocentric political autobiography, Yippie slogans, revolution for the TV cameras, and a dose of paranoia that reduces the complexities of politics, revolution and man himself into eerie, simplistic symbols of good and evil – this passion and distortion only a bane to a true revolution which depends for its very survival on a cool-headed appraisal of power and personality, of action and reaction. Nowhere in all the excitement of describing how Uncle Sam was baited in Chicago, at the Pentagon, in Woodstock does Hoffman ever really step out of his grandiose, mind-blown world to consider the terrors of revolution."

Hoffman dwells constantly upon his amorality. He advocates destruction of schools; he despises the American flag; he idolizes the late Ché Guevara. He boasts of his marijuana smoking, his LSD trips, and his other drug experiences. He calls himself a "cultural revolutionary" and "not a political revolutionary." Yet he supports the Viet Cong; he condemns capitalism and America; and he campaigned for Stuart Hughes who was seeking a seat in the U.S. Senate as a "peace" candidate. He has written: "Revolution for the hell of it? Why not? It's a bunch of phony words anyway. Once one has experienced LSD, existential revolution, fought the intellectual game-playing of the individual in society, one's identity, one realizes that action is the only reality; not only reality but morality as well. One learns reality is a subjective experience. It exists in my head. I am the Revolution."

HALLOCK HOFFMAN was born on January 15, 1919 in Columbia, South Carolina, son of Dorothy Brown and Paul G. Hoffman. He married Elinor Knudsen. He is an alumnus of Kenyon College.

From 1952 until 1954, Hoffman worked for the ultra-leftist and pacifist American Friends Service Committee. From 1954 until 1969, he was on the staff of the ultra-radical, pro-Socialist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. From 1959 until 1967, he was secretary-treasurer of the Center. He also served as the staff director for the Center's study of the political process and as a senior fellow. In 1969, the high priest of the Center, Robert M. Hutchins, ousted Hoffman during the course of a palace revolution. As Hoffman and eleven others were deprived of their senior fellowships, Hutchins explained that there was need for a change at the Center, and that the time had come to concentrate on "man and the modern world."

In the meantime, Hoffman had become affiliated with Pacifica Foundation. From 1964 until 1966, he was president of Pacifica, and since 1966 he has been chairman of the board. Pacifica operates non-commercial, "educational" radio stations KPFA-FM and KPFB in Berkeley, KPFK-FM in Los Angeles, and WBAI-FM in New York City. (It has applications pending for stations in Houston and Washington, D.C.) Pacifica's radio stations have had a long history of serving as outlets for Communists, Communist-fronters, racist revolutionaries, and other radicals. Pacifica has employed notorious Communists for work on its radio programs.

Hoffman is a long-time sponsor of the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has also had a long-time affiliation with the leftwing-globalist United World Federalists.

HALSTED REID HOLMAN was born on January 17, 1925 in Cleveland, Ohio, son of Ann Purdy and Emile Holman. He married Barbara Lucas. He is an alumnus of Yale University's School of Medicine (M.D., 1949). His pre-medical studies were pursued at Stanford University and the University of California at Los Angeles.

In 1949 and 1950, Holman was a research fellow in chemistry at the Carlsberg Laboratories in Copenhagen, Denmark. From 1952 until 1955, he was at the Montefiore Hospital in New York City: as an intern (1952-1953) and a resident (1953-1955). From 1955 until 1960, he was an assistant physician and an assistant professor at the Rockefeller

Institute in New York City. Since 1960, he has been at Stanford University's School of Medicine as a professor of medicine and department head.

While a medical student at Yale, Holman was president of the Association of Interns and Medical Students, an organization which was a "faithful follower of the Communist Party line." In 1950, he became the international representative of AIMS, and in this position, during 1950 and 1951, he travelled throughout Europe, visiting Czecho-Slovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, and the Soviet Union. During the course of his travels he attended the second World Student Congress in Prague. He had helped to organize this Communist-led meeting while in Sofia, Bulgaria, in September 1949, at the Council of the International Union of Students, an "international Communist front." He was a vice president of the IUS. (The only other vice presidents of the IUS were from Britain, France, Red China, Cuba, and the Soviet Union.) (During the Prague congress, Holman wrote an article for the *World Student News* ["The Aim of our Common Struggle is Peace"], in which he said: "Students play a considerable role in the American people's struggle to ban atomic weapons, abolish the witch hunt, and secure a lasting peace; a large proportion of the signatures to the Stockholm Peace Appeal gained in the United States were obtained by students and youth generally. Significantly, the flow of signatures increased greatly after the attack on the Korean People's Republic. Progressive students recognize the foreign aggression in Korea, inspired by the American imperialists, as yet another dangerous provocation of the warmongers and expressed their anger by a number of strikes, demonstrations, protest meetings, and resolutions testifying that America's progressive students are determined to do their share in preventing another world war.")

In 1951, Holman organized and attended the World Youth Festival in East Berlin, where he associated with such notorious Communists as Gerhard Eisler, Pablo Neruda, and Liang Ken of Red China.

In 1952, when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was investigating Communist tactics in controlling youth organizations, Holman was subpoenaed to testify. He pleaded protection of the Fifth Amendment when asked about his alleged membership in the Communist Party, his association with known Communists, his affiliation with the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – "Communist front"), his affiliation with the Progressive Citizens of America in Connecticut ("infiltrated and dominated by members of the Communist Party"), and his alleged promotion of the Stockholm Peace Appeal ("Communist Party campaign").

After his 1952 appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, Holman's leftwing activities remained obscure until 1961, when his signature appeared on an advertisement in the *Washington Post.* The advertisement was paid for by the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee. In 1962, he sponsored a leftwing conference ("The Impact of the Radical Right") in San Francisco. In the mid-1960's, he became an activist in the leftist anti-Vietnam War teach-in movement. (Holman's parents were activists in Communist fronts, and in 1952, Holman refused to tell the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee whether or not his wife was a member of the Communist Party.)

FRANCIS H. HORN was born on November 18, 1908 in Toledo, Ohio, son of Orpha Bennett and Henry Horn. He married Xenia Beliavsky. He is an alumnus of Dartmouth College (A.B., 1930), the University of Virginia (M.A., 1934), and Yale University (Ph.D., 1942).

From 1930 until 1933, Horn was an instructor of English and history at the American University in Cairo, Egypt. From 1936 until 1942, he was at the Junior College of Commerce (now Quinnipiac College) in Hamden, Connecticut: assistant dean (1936-1937); acting dean (1937-1938); and dean (1938-1942). In 1945 and 1946, he was assistant dean at the American University in Biarritz, France. In 1946 and 1947, he worked on a cooperative study of the Lincoln, Nebraska schools. From 1947 until 1953, he was at Johns Hopkins University: dean of the evening division, director of the summer session, and associate professor of education (1947-1951); acting chairman of the education department (1951); and visiting professor of education (1952-1953). From 1951 until 1953, he was the National Education Association's executive secretary for higher education. From 1953 until 1957, he was president of Pratt Institute in Brooklyn. In 1957 and 1958, he was a visiting professor of higher education at the University of Southern Illinois. From 1958 until 1967, he was president of the University of Rhode Island. Since 1967, he has been president of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities in the State of New York.

Horn is a member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, which directs propaganda toward the American people on behalf of the Red-dominated UNESCO. He is on the national advisory board of the ultra-leftist, one-world United World Federalists. He is a member of Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union, two leftist-internationalist groups.

HAROLD E. HUGHES was born on February 10, 1922 in Ida Grove, Iowa, son of Etta Kelly and Lewis Hughes. He married Eva Mae Mercer. He attended the University of Iowa for one year.

From 1946 until 1958, Hughes was in the trucking industry. From 1958 until 1962, he was the elected Commissioner of Commerce for Iowa. (Until 1958, Hughes was a Republican; he switched to the Democrat Party when he ran for the Commerce post.)

In 1960, Hughes was unsuccessful in his bid for the Democrat Party's gubernatorial nomination. But in 1962 he was nominated and elected, and he served from 1963 until 1969 as Governor of Iowa. In that office he proved to be a flaming liberal. He opposed Iowa's right-to-work law; he promoted civil rights legislation; he sponsored open-housing laws; and he followed the liberals' tradition of tax-and-spend to introduce social reforms. In Hughes' five gubernatorial years, Iowa's budget more than doubled and state taxes reached an all-time high.

In 1968, at the insistence of the late Robert F. Kennedy, Hughes became a candidate for the United States Senate. The Hughes-Kennedy relationship was tinged with irony because, from 1960 until 1967, Hughes had been one of Lyndon B. Johnson's staunchest supporters; yet before the assassination of Kennedy in 1968, he was reportedly planning to endorse Kennedy for the Democratic presidential nomination. Then, at the Democratic National Convention in 1968, Hughes continued to play his political version of musical chairs by nominating Eugene McCarthy for the presidency. When McCarthy's campaign collapsed, Hughes endorsed Hubert Humphrey for the presidency.

Hughes' erratic search for a political idol did not hurt his own political fortunes. In 1968, he was elected to the United States Senate. Almost immediately he became a leader of the dovish clique in the Senate. To attain such a position, the principles he held when Lyndon Johnson was dominating the political scene had to undergo a radical change.

As Governor of Iowa, Hughes centered his foreign policy interests on the Vietnam War. He was totally committed to the support of Lyndon Johnson's "leadership in Vietnam." When Johnson's political fortunes sagged, Hughes became a worrier – "questions began to rise and haunt me" – the "questions became too intense to live with" – "there were no rational answers." He worried about peace, poverty, equality of opportunity, the realities of the nuclear age, and the costly and pointless war. The Senate's Majority leaders, Mike Mansfield and Edward Kennedy, showered praise on Hughes' demagogic liberalism as he echoed their sentiments that the Senate had "to meet the needs of the hungry and starving, housing needs, the needs of the underprivileged, the needs of education, and needs in every area."

The first major issue faced by Hughes in the Senate was the debate over the anti-ballistic missile system. Hughes offered the stereotyped liberal line: "The ABM is of historic importance as a symbol of the military psychology that has such a dominant and pervasive influence on our culture and economy." He was worried about the arms race, the contamination of the atmosphere, the collision course being pursued by the United States and the Soviet Union, and the disturbance of the strategic balance between the great powers. His worries were a synthesis of the dovish remarks that had been uttered by such liberals as Martin L. King Jr., George McGovern, Eugene McCarthy, Benjamin Spock, Edward Kennedy, and J. William Fulbright. But the left-liberal press media somehow found Hughes to be original and began mentioning him as a 1972 presidential candidate.

In April 1970, the Vietnam Moratorium Committee promoted a gimmick – the "Peace Fast Fund" – through newspaper advertisements. Peaceniks would fast for three days and contribute the money normally spent for meals to the American Friends Service Committee's Relief Program for *North* and South Vietnam, the National Welfare Rights Organization, and Cesar Chavez' United Farm Workers of America. (Contributions were to be made to the latter two groups because allegedly the money they needed was being used to finance the war.) Hughes gave his endorsement to the gimmick and its subversive intent – relief for the enemy in North Vietnam: "The Peace Fast of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee affords an opportunity for Americans of goodwill everywhere to translate their prayers for peace into humane help for the innocent victims of war. Once again the Moratorium Committee is proving that the vast majority of Americans identified with the peace movement are motivated by impulses that are constructive, dignified, and high-minded."

THOMAS L. HUGHES was born on December 11, 1925 in Mankato, Minnesota, son of Alice Lowe and Evan Raymond. He married Jean Reiman. He is an alumnus of Carleton College (B.A., 1947); Oxford University (B. Phil, 1949), where he was a Rhodes scholar; and Yale University (LL.B., 1952).

Hughes' Rhodes scholarship was the key to a crowded and hectic career in the midst of the Liberal Establishment. Between 1949 and 1961, Hughes attended Yale Law School and was admitted to the practice of law in Minnesota and before the Supreme Court of the United States; served on the staff of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Labor and Labor-Management Relations and the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (1951-1952); served, as a commissioned officer, in the Judge Advocate General's department of the U.S. Air Force (1952-1954); was an associate professor of political science and international relations at the University of Southern California (1953-1954) and Trinity College of Texas (1954); was executive secretary to Connecticut's leftwing governor, Abe Ribicoff (1954-1955); was legislative counsel to Minnesota's leftist U.S. Senator, Hubert S. Humphrey (1955-1958); was an associate professor of political science and international relations at George Washington University (1957-1958); was administrative assistant to Connecticut's leftist U.S. Representative, Chester Bowles (1959-1960); and somehow found time to serve as a staff assistant at the Democratic National Convention in 1952 and 1956 and as the staff director of the platform committee of the 1960 Democratic National Convention. (In 1944, at the age of nineteen, he was a staff assistant at the Democratic National Convention.)

In January 1961, Hughes joined the Department of State as a foreign affairs officer and consultant. Within five weeks, he became a special assistant to Under Secretary of State Chester Bowles, for whom he had been administrative assistant in 1959 and 1960. Less than four months later, he became deputy director for intelligence and research under the leftist Roger Hilsman Jr. In 1963, Hughes succeeded Hilsman as Director of Intelligence and Research, a position he held until 1969. In 1969, President Nixon appointed Hughes to be Minister and deputy chief of the mission at the U.S. Embassy in London. In 1970, Hughes became a member of the State Department's planning and coordination staff. As of 1971, Hughes will be the president of the ultra-leftist internationalist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He succeeds the leftist Joseph E. Johnson, who has held the CEIP's presidency since 1950. (Johnson's predecessor in the position was Alger Hiss.)

RUBY HURLEY was born in Washington, D.C., daughter of Alice Patterson and Edward Ruffin. She attended Miner Teachers College and Terrell Law School.

From 1943 until 1951, Miss Hurley was youth secretary for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. (In 1947, she sponsored the World Youth Festival, held under the auspices of the World Federation of Democratic Youth ["a pressure group in behalf of Soviet foreign policy"] and the International Union of Students [administered and directed by "a 17-man executive committee of whom 12 were known Communists"]). In 1951 and 1952, she was southeastern regional coordinator for the NAACP in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and Tennessee. When the region was expanded to include North Carolina and South Carolina, she became regional secretary and regional director – positions she still holds. The 90,000 adults and 13,000 youths of the NAACP's membership under Miss Hurley's control have been in the forefront of militant racial activities during the past two decades.

HOMER A. JACK was born on May 19, 1916 in Rochester, New York, son of Cecelia Davis and Alexander Jack. He married Esther Williams. He is an alumnus of Cornell University (B.S., 1936; M.S., 1937; Ph.D., 1940) and Meadville Theological School (B.D., 1945). In 1943, he was ordained to the ministry of the Unitarian Church. He held ministries in Lawrence, Kansas (1943-1944), and Evanston, Illinois (1948-1959). He is the author of *Biological Field Stations of the World* (1945); *The Wit and Wisdom of Gandhi* (1951); *Albert Schweitzer Festschrift* (1955); *The Gandhi Reader* (1956); *Religion and Peace* (1966); and *World Religions and World Peace* (1969).

From 1943 until 1948, Jack was executive secretary of the Chicago Council against Racial and Religious Discrimination. In 1959 and 1960, he was associate director of the leftist American Committee on Africa. In 1960, he helped to organize the ultra-leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and from 1960 until 1964, he was the Committee's executive director. In 1964, he resigned his position at SANE to become director of the social responsibility department of the Unitarian-Universalist Association. (Jack's change of jobs was deemed by the Communists to be important enough to warrant a news story in their *National Guardian* of September 12, 1964.)

Jack's racial agitating has been exemplified by his affiliation with the American Civil Liberties Union. (He spent ten days on the scene of Martin L. King's infamous Selma, Alabama march.) His leftwing pacifism has been extended by his membership in the extremely radical Fellowship of Reconciliation and its satellite Turn Toward Peace. He has also been active in the equally radical Committee for Nonviolent Action.

On April 12, 1953, Jack preached a sermon (later published in pamphlet form), "Who Ought to Investigate Whom," a malicious attack upon any and all congressional investigations of Communists and Communism. In the Communists' *Daily Worker* of June 19, 1953, Jack's name appeared as a signatory to an open letter to President Eisenhower urging clemency for the convicted A-bomb spies, Julius and Ethel Rosenberg. In the *Daily Worker* of December 8, 1957, Jack's name appeared on an appeal for recognition of Red China.

JESSE JACKSON was born on October 8, 1941 in Greenville, South Carolina, son of Helen and Charles Jackson. He married Jacqueline Brown. In 1959 and 1960, he attended the University of Illinois on an athletic scholarship. He transferred to North Carolina Agricultural and Technical Institute in 1960. (He has explained that he left Illinois because he was subjected to racial discrimination. He has also explained that he was attracted to North Carolina A & T because he was impressed by the A & T students who were conducting sit-in demonstrations in Greensboro.)

In 1963, while attending North Carolina A & T, Jackson became the leader of student demonstrators to force racial integration in Greensboro's theaters and restaurants. He became president of North Carolina's Intercollegiate Council on Human Rights. He received his B.A. degree in 1963.

On a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, Jackson enrolled in the Chicago Theological Seminary in 1964. In 1965, he received his B.D. degree from the Seminary and later was ordained a Baptist minister.

During Jackson's seminarian days, he began a close association with Martin L. King Jr. He first met King during the latter's famous 1965 demonstrations in Selma, Alabama. And, in 1965, Jackson worked part-time for the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations, a Chicago group formed to support King's agitational activities. (Jackson became such a devoted follower of King that King became godfather to Jackson's third child. At various times Jackson spoke of King: "Then there was Dr. King. For me he has become a father image, a preacher image, and I guess the one I talk about least is the brother image; a very personal friend who would give me much advice, who used to talk with me about preparing myself for leadership, who indicated the kinds of books I ought to read, then talked with me and interpreted some of them." – "Certainly my real education has been my association with Jim Farmer, Floyd McKissick, and Dr. King." – King was "my father figure, my brother figure, and my teacher.")

In 1966, King moved into Chicago and launched Operation Breadbasket, an economic pressure arm of his Southern Christian Leadership Conference. From the beginning Jackson was the director of Operation Breadbasket, and eventually King named Jackson national director of the project as it expanded to other cities, including Brooklyn, Cleveland, Houston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, and Indianapolis.

Jackson's strategy with Operation Breadbasket was to mobilize black economic power as a coercive force against the business community of the Chicago area. His tactics were picket lines, demonstrations, and boycotts. His goals included new and/or better jobs for blacks, more accounts with black banks, and more business for black companies. He began his campaign by instituting boycotts against dairy and soft drink companies and forcing the companies to hire more blacks. He then attacked grocery chains and won victories over Atlantic & Pacific, the Jewel Tea Company, National Tea Company, and others. He forced Chicago stores to carry products manufactured and/or processed by black-owned companies. He forced stores to use services of black-owned janitorial and maintenance companies. He forced chains to hire and to promote blacks. He forced companies to use services of black banks. He forced chains to construct and refurbish stores through the services of black construction companies.

Early in Operation Breadbasket's history, Jackson instituted Saturday morning meetings, which in recent years have been held at Mount Pisgah Baptist Church. It is not unusual to have as many as four thousand in attendance at the meetings, which are a combination of prayers, gospel singing, jazz sessions, speeches by guests, and harangues by Jackson. Politicians and business leaders, black and white, attend the Saturday meetings almost as if they were responding to a bid for a command performance. The attention, or lack of it, paid to them by Jackson determines their status in the favor of Operation Breadbasket's activists.

Jackson brought to Operation Breadbasket an unmistakable attitude of racism, heavily laced with leftism. The Communist Party's *Political Affairs* quoted him: "Sometime before the night is over we [blacks] are going to talk not just about jobs but we are going to talk about capitalism itself. For a long time people did not talk about capitalism because of the McCarthyism. People have been afraid of using the word because the alternative is supposed to be communism. Whether or not that is the alternative, capitalism is a bad system." On other occasions, Jackson said: "Black people must have control of eleven per cent of Chicago." – "When we change the race problem into a class fight between the haves and the have-nots, then we are going to have a new ball game." – "America is pluralistic. There is talk about it being a melting pot. But it really is more like vegetable soup. There are separate pieces of corn, meat and so on, each with its own identity. The blacks have been pushed down to the bottom of the pot. We are going to come up and be recognized or turn the pot over." – "We live under colonialism because white people who don't live in our community own everything in it." – "I discovered [in Chicago] that we live in the jaws of the beast who is a racist – demoralized by his racist spirit, contained by his militarism, and starved by his misuse of capitalism. That's the way he whips the game." (Lending prestige to Jackson's Operation Breadbasket have been such leftists and/or racist agitators as Sidney Poitier, Bill Cosby, France Nuyen, Robert Culp, Dick Gregory, and Coretta King. Jackson is friendly with Black Panther leader Huey Newton and, at various times, he has expressed his admiration for Stokely Carmichael, James Bevel, and the late Malcolm X.)

In 1968, after little more than a year directing Operation Breadbasket, Jackson was recognized as a political force: Chicagoan and Illinoisan office-seekers vied for his support; presidential hopefuls George McGovern and Eugene McCarthy actively sought his endorsement; and, in the long run, a grateful Hubert Humphrey did receive his endorsement.

When Martin L. King was murdered, Jackson was at his side as a friend and close associate in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. A short time later, Jackson played a prominent role in the 1968 March on Washington which King had planned as a "Poor People's March." Ralph Abernathy, who had assumed leadership of King's SCLC, appointed Jackson mayor of "Resurrection City" – the campsite in Washington, D.C. to which innocent and some not so innocent blacks and whites were enticed and which served as headquarters for agitational activities against the federal government. But in a power struggle with Abernathy over leadership of the SCLC, Jackson was removed as mayor of Resurrection City. Since the summer of 1968, he has generally confined his activities to Operation Breadbasket in Chicago and throughout Illinois.

In 1969, Jackson became a chief adviser to an Afro-American Police Association within the Chicago Police Department. In May 1969, he led three thousand followers in a hunger march to the State House in Springfield, Illinois. And, he achieved recognition as an hierarchical leftist when he was the subject for a cover-story in the April 6, 1970 issue of *Time* magazine.

PAUL JACOBS was born on August 24, 1918 in New York City, son of Tecla Schmidt and Julius Jacobs. He married Ruth Rosenfield. He studied at the College of the City of New York and the University of Minnesota. He is the co-author of *Old Age and Political Behavior*

(1959); *Labor in a Free Society* (1961); and *The New Radicals* (1966). He is the author of *State of the Unions* (1963); *Is Curly Jewish?* (1965); and *Prelude to Riot* (1968). Among the various publications to which he has contributed articles have been the leftwing *Ramparts* magazine and pro-Communist *Liberation,* edited by David Dellinger.

Jacobs has said that from 1935 until 1940 he was a "professional revolutionist, attempting to overcome U.S. government by force and violence." (Jacobs was not being totally facetious. He was a Trotskyite, and a member of the Young Communist League.) From 1941 until 1943, he was an organizer for Socialist David Dubinsky's International Ladies Garment Workers Union. (Jacobs has been a member of the Socialist Party.) From 1946 until 1948, he was a race relations specialist for the American Jewish Committee. Since 1959, he has been on the staff of the ultra-radical Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Since 1964, he has been on the research staff of the Center for the Study of Law and Society at the University of California at Berkeley. (At Berkeley, Jacobs has been an enthusiastic supporter of student militants in their demonstrations against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in their Free [Filthy] Speech Movement, in their anti-draft postures, and in their anti-Vietnam War activities. In the mid-1960's he boasted that he was "an ex-bolshevik and . . . still a radical. I've belonged to organizations on the subversive list and I support the sit-ins and the sit-downs and I'm against the war in Viet Nam and I'm not going to pay my income tax because of the war.")

Jacobs has been affiliated with leftwing racial agitators in the Congress of Racial Equality, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He has been a member of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. In 1965, he was a member of the leftwing Writers and Artists Protest against the Vietnam War. In 1965, he joined in the Declaration of Conscience, sponsored by the leftwing-pacifist *Catholic Worker,* Committee for Nonviolent Action, Student Peace Union, and War Resisters League. ("We hereby declare our conscientious refusal to cooperate with the United States government in the prosecution of the war in Vietnam . . . . We urge others to refuse and refuse ourselves to take part in the manufacture or transportation of military equipment, or to work in the fields of military research and weapons development.") In 1968, he joined the New University Conference, a group of leftwing "intellectuals."

Jacobs has been a consultant to the Peace Corps and the War on Poverty program.

[EVERETT] LEROI JONES was born on October 7, 1934 in Newark, New Jersey, son of Anna Russ and Coyette Jones. He was married to and divorced from Hettie Cohen. He is married to Sylvia Robinson, who has adopted the name Amini. He attended Rutgers University for one year. He is an alumnus of Howard University (B.A., 1954), Columbia University (M.A.), and New School for Social Research (M.A.). He has been an instructor at New School. He has been a visiting professor at the University of Buffalo, Columbia University, and San Francisco State College. He has held a John Whitney Foundation fellowship and a Guggenheim fellowship.

In 1958, Jones began a professional literary career when he founded *Yugen* magazine, an underground poetry publication. He has been a prolific poet, playwright, essayist, and novelist. He has been a contributor to such publications as *Evergreen Review, Poetry, Saturday Review, Downbeat, Metronome, Nation, Negro Digest,* and various underground publications.

Almost all of Jones' better known writings reflect his passionate hatred of whites: "We [blacks] must eliminate the white man before we will ever be able to draw a free breath on this planet." – "We [blacks] must make our own world, man, and we cannot do this unless the white man is dead. Let's get together and kill him." (Jones, who spent about two years in the U.S. Air Force, once explained: "The Howard [University] thing let me understand the Negro sickness. They teach you how to pretend to be white. But the Air Force made me understand the white sickness. It shocked me into realizing what was happening to me and others. By oppressing Negroes, the whites have become oppressors, twisted in that sense of doing bad things to people and justifying them finally, convincing themselves they are right, as people have always convinced themselves.")

In general, Jones' writings have been characterized by vulgarity, scatology, obscenity, and blasphemy. But no matter how shocking or sensational his language and no matter how incoherent, illogical, or obscure his theme, Jones has been taken quite seriously by critics in *Newsweek, Time, Esquire,* the *New York Times, Saturday Review, Commonweal, Mademoiselle,* and in university classrooms.

Early in his career, Jones established himself as a leader for the causes of black separatism and black nationalism (he even revived the old Communist dream of a black republic). Later, he became concerned with the dissemination of Afro-Islamic culture among blacks.

Jones has used many vehicles in the promotion of his causes. In 1961, he co-founded an avant-garde American Theatre for Poets. In the early 1960's, he gave readings in lower Manhattan coffee houses. He was a co-editor of an underground newsletter, *Floating Bear.* He was co-editor of an alleged "review of the arts," which was crudely obscene, if not worse. In 1964, he founded the Black Arts Repertory Theatre. (After about a year of operation, the Repertory Theatre was closed down when it was discovered that Jones was using Harlem Youth [HARYOU] federal funds to finance the viciously anti-white presentations of his troupe.)

In 1966, Jones returned to his native Newark, where he founded and became the director of Spirit House, which soon became a "cultural" and political center for blacks. Then, in January 1968, Jones organized the Black Community Development & Defense. According to *Ebony* magazine ("Ameer [LeRoi Jones] Baraka," by David Llorens, August 1969), the BCD&D "is made up of about 100 men (including teachers, clerks, laborers, etc., and a hard core of rugged young men called Simbas, which is Swahili for lions) and half that number of women. The Organization, as it is routinely called, is dedicated to the creation of a new value system for the Afro-American community. The most visible aspects of their changing values are traditional African dress, the speaking of Swahili at least as much as English, and the absence of Christian names. But a closer look reveals, to an extent not observed in the divided black community of any class, traits such as courtesy, promptness, propriety, and a willingness to share both information and tangibles. They don't appear deprived for having given up alcohol, tobacco, narcotics, pork, and the ordinary American sexual contests." For his part, Jones adopted the Arabic name of Ameer Baraka, with the title Imamu (Spiritual Leader), and became a minister of the Kawaida sect of Muslims.

Jones has had a rather stormy career in Newark. During that city's racial riots in 1967, he was arrested and convicted for carrying weapons. He was sentenced to New Jersey's state penitentiary and fined $1000. He appealed his conviction to the U.S. Supreme Court but his appeal was rejected. Eight months later, the Supreme Court reversed itself and ordered a new trial for Jones. He was acquitted of all charges in the second trial. In 1968, he was arrested in Newark for using loud and abusive language. He was fined $100 and sentenced to sixty days' imprisonment. In the same year, he was an unsuccessful candidate for Newark's community council. And he has been in the midst of racial disturbances that have plagued Newark in recent years.

Jones has evidently been clear of formal leftwing affiliations. However, in 1960, he did visit Cuba to demonstrate his support for Castro and his regime. And, in two of his works, Jones glorified Castro: *January 1st, 1959: Fidel Castro* and *Cuba Libre* – the latter published by the Communist front, Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

PERCY JULIAN was born on April 11, 1899 in Montgomery, Alabama, son of Elizabeth Adams and James Julian. He married Anna Johnson. He is an alumnus of DePauw University (A.B., 1920), Harvard University (A.M., 1923), and the University of Vienna (Ph.D., 1931).

From 1920 until 1922, Julian was a chemistry instructor at Fisk University. From 1922 until 1926, he was a research fellow in chemistry at Harvard University. In 1926 and 1927, he was a chemistry professor at West Virginia State College. From 1927 until 1929, he was an associate professor of chemistry at Howard University. From 1929 until 1931, he was a fellow at the University of Vienna. In 1931 and 1932, he was a chemistry professor and department chairman at Howard University. From 1932 until 1936, he was a research fellow and instructor of organic chemistry at DePauw University. From 1936 until 1953, he was a research director with The Glidden Company. From 1953 until 1964, he was president of Julian Laboratories. Since 1964, he has been president of the Julian Research Institute.

Julian has been on the board of directors of the socialist-oriented Fund for the Republic and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. He has been a national committeeman of the ultra-radical American Civil Liberties Union. He has been a generous supporter of the NAACP's Legal Defense and Education Fund, which has been the legal arm of racial agitators in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Congress of Racial Equality, and the Student Nonviolent (National) Coordinating Committee.

MARVIN L. KALB was born on June 9, 1930 in New York City, son of Bella Portnoy and Max Kalb. He married Madeleine Green. He is an alumnus of the City College of New York (B.S., 1951) and Harvard University (M.A., 1953). He is the author of *Eastern Exposure* (1958); *Dragon in the Kremlin* (1961); and *The Volga: A Po-*

litical Journey through Russia (1967).

In 1956 and 1957, Kalb was with the Department of State, stationed in Moscow as a press attaché. Since 1957, he has been with the Columbia Broadcasting System as a commentator and correspondent for television and radio. From 1960 until 1963, he was stationed in Moscow. Since 1963, he has been CBS' diplomatic correspondent, based in Washington, D.C.

Kalb has exploited his four years of residence in Moscow to create a reputation as an expert Kremlinologist and Sovietologist, especially through his frequent contributions to *Saturday Review,* the *New York Times Magazine, Reporter,* and the *Sunday Times* of London. In the overall content of his rather prolific output on the Soviet Union, Kalb has never been as crude as the late Walter Duranty or as pedestrian as Harrison Salisbury – two American Moscow-based correspondents who provided a steady stream of misinformation and pro-Soviet propaganda to American readers. Nevertheless, Kalb has become an accomplished exponent of the liberal-leftist line when writing about the Soviet Union. (It is not altogether surprising that Kalb is an ardent admirer of Salisbury.)

From Kalb's perspective the Soviet Union is "a fiercely nationalistic country" – not a rapacious empire. He insists that there have been substantive changes between the days of Stalin, the days of Khrushchev, and the days of Kosygin. He simply refuses to acknowledge that the Soviet Union is now as it has always been an absolute and implacable enemy of the United States and all other free nations. (He once offered an explanation that the difference between the Stalin regime and that of Khrushchev was that "the present Soviet Government . . . prefers subtle pressures to brute force" – which simply indicated that Kalb could not or would not recognize the difference between shadow and substance.)

The relationship between the Soviet Union and Red China has been represented by Kalb as so hostile that the Soviet regime is most eager to obtain a genuine rapprochement with the United States. Kalb is so convinced of the Russians' sincerity that he enthusiastically recommends expansion of US-USSR "cultural exchanges," and he is most anxious that two-way tourism be experienced by Americans and Russians so that they may better understand each other.

Kalb has found fault with the Soviet system, especially in the alleged or real mistreatment of the Russian literati. But he has remained strangely silent on the Soviet Union's barbaric captivity of entire nations or the plight of the Russian people in concentration camps, where cruelty has not ameliorated no matter the changes of leaders in the Kremlin. And for every instance in which he has called attention to the low-level standard of living endured by the Russian people, he offers a folksy story to indicate how similar they are to the American people.

Although Kalb recognizes the enormous amount of energy expended by the Russians on propaganda, he accepts their claims for economic, scientific, and military accomplishments at face value.

On the American scene, Kalb is in the usual mold of liberal commentators. He is fearful of the military-industrial complex. He remembers the "dark days of McCarthyism." He is a great admirer of J. William Fulbright, whom he considers to be "deeply intellectual." He somehow discovered statesmanlike qualities in George W. Ball. And in the matter of the Vietnam War, he considered Robert McNamara and Dean Rusk to be hawkish and Lyndon Johnson bent on military victory. If Kalb were a joiner, he would be well qualified for membership in the Council on Foreign Relations.

MAX M. KAMPELMAN was born on November 7, 1920 in New York City, son of Eva Gottlieb and Joseph Kampelmacher. He married Marjorie Buetow. He is an alumnus of New York University (A.B., 1940; LL.B., 1945) and the University of Minnesota (M.A., 1946; Ph.D., 1951). He is the author of *The Communist Party vs. The C.I.O.: A Study in Power Politics* (1957). He is the co-author of *The Strategy of Deception* (1963). He has contributed articles to the *Annals* of the Academy of Political and Social Science.

In 1940 and 1941, Kampelman was on the research staff of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. From 1941 until 1943, he was a law clerk in New York City. He was a conscientious objector during World War II. From 1946 until 1948, he was a political science instructor at the University of Minnesota. From 1948 until 1950, he was on Bennington College's faculty in the department of political economy. In 1947 and 1948, he lectured at the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin. From 1954 until 1956, he was a visiting professorial lecturer at Howard University. In 1963, he was a visiting distinguished professor of political science at Claremont College. Since 1956, he has practiced law in Washington, D.C.

In 1947, Kampelman became a prominent political activist in Minnesota. He joined the political forces of Minneapolis' Mayor Hubert H. Humphrey. In 1948, Kampelman – a Socialist and a pacifist – supported the presidential candidacy of Norman Thomas. At the same time, he served as chairman of the public affairs committee of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action in Minnesota. Kampelman and other ADA'ers signed an endorsement for Thomas: "We believe that the United States needs a President who stands for peace and against the get-tough policies of the Democratic and Republican parties and the war-breeding appeasement of the Communist-dominated [Henry A.] Wallace movement. America needs a President who opposes the 'free enterprise' slogans of Truman, Taft and Wallace [*sic*] – slogans which have led us repeatedly into the jaws of cruel unemployment and misery. America needs a President who will bring us democratic social ownership of America's major industries . . . . And America needs a mass political party of all workers of hand and brain dedicated to a program like that of the British Labor Party."

From 1949 until 1955, Kampelman was legislative counsel to U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, and since then he has remained a close adviser to Humphrey. (Allan Ryskind in his *Hubert* recounts: "In October 1967, it was revealed that Max Kampelman, Humphrey's close friend and unofficial adviser, was a central figure in a controversial Agency for International Development transaction in India. The United States is faced with a $4 million loss as a result, and the matter is now under investigation by the Justice Department. Partly as a result of Kampelman's role in this affair, he was turned down as a chairman of Washington, D.C.'s new City Council.")

Since Kampelman settled down in a law practice in Washington, D.C., he has served on the board of directors of the National Training Laboratories, a division of the leftist-oriented National Education Association. He has become a major in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve. He has served as vice president of Operations & Policy Research, Incorporated – a "think factory" specializing in research related to government and the social sciences. He has become a national council member of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He is on the board of directors of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council of the United States. In 1966 and 1967, he was a senior adviser for the United States mission to the United Nations.

MILTON KATZ was born on November 29, 1907 in New York City, son of Clara Schiffman and Morris Katz. He married Vivian Greenberg. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1927; LL.B., 1931). He is the author of *Cases and Materials in Administrative Law* (1947); *The Things That Are Caesar's* (1966); and *The Relevance of International Adjudication* (1968). He is the co-author of *Government under Law and the Individual* (1957) and *Law of International Transactions and Relations* (1960).

In 1931 and 1932, Katz was a legal secretary to U.S. Circuit Court Justice Julian Mack. From 1932 until 1939, he was in the midst of the New Deal Administration: attorney in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1932-1933); assistant counsel in the National Recovery Administration (1933-1935); executive assistant to the chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission (1935-1938); and special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States (1938-1939). In 1939 and 1940, he was a lecturer on law at Harvard University. From 1941 until 1943, he was a solicitor with the War Production Board. In 1942 and 1943, he was a United States executive officer with the Combined Production and Resources Board. In 1943 and 1944, he was with the Office of Strategic Services.

Since 1940, Katz has held the rank of professor of law at Harvard University, and since 1955, he has been the director of international legal studies. In 1949 and 1950, he was the U.S. representative on the Economic Commission for Europe, with the rank of Ambassador. In 1950 and 1951, he was chairman of the financial and economic committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. From 1951 until 1954, he was associate director, and since 1954, a consultant, for the Ford Foundation, which has dispensed millions of dollars to leftist groups, causes, and individuals. In 1965, he was chairman of the manpower committee of the White House Conference on International Cooperation. In 1967, he was a consultant to the assistant secretary for education in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Katz is a trustee of the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is a trustee of the leftist-pacifist World Peace Foundation. He is a sponsor of the leftist-pacifist World Affairs Council. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

CARL KAYSEN was born on March 5, 1920 in Philadelphia, son of Elizabeth Resnick and Samuel Kaysen. He married Annette Neutra. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (A.B., 1940) and Harvard University (A.M., 1947; Ph.D., 1954). From 1940 until 1942, he pursued graduate studies at Columbia University and while a graduate student, worked as a researcher in the National Bureau of Economic Research in New York City.

In 1942, at the age of twenty-two, Kaysen went to Washington, D.C., where he worked for the Office of Strategic Services as a research analyst on German military and economic capacity. From 1943 until 1945, he was in the Army Air Corps doing "intelligence" work. From 1947 until 1950, he was a junior fellow in the Society of Fellows at Harvard University. In the same period, without legal training, he served as a law clerk to Charles E. Wyzanski Jr., a leftist-oriented federal judge in Boston.

From 1950 until 1966, Kaysen was at Harvard University: as assistant professor of economics (1950-1955); associate professor (1955-1957); professor (1957-1966); associate dean of the graduate school of public administration (1960-1966); and Littauer professor of political economy (1964-1966). Since 1966, he has been director of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, New Jersey. (The Institute, since its inception, has been a haven for leftwing academicians, including J. Robert Oppenheimer [Kaysen's predecessor], Albert Einstein, and George F. Kennan.)

In 1955 and 1956, Kaysen was a visiting Fulbright professor and a Guggenheim Foundation fellow at the London School of Economics, the homestead of Fabian Socialism. In 1959, he went to Greece on a Ford Foundation grant to study the United States aid program.

From 1961 until 1963, Kaysen was a deputy special assistant for national security affairs to President John F. Kennedy. His advice was given to the President on disarmament, military budget and planning, and Africa. (The *New York Times* reported that Kaysen was instrumental in the completion of the 1963 nuclear test ban treaty with the Soviet Union.)

Before and since his stint with the Kennedy Administration, Kaysen's consultant services have been utilized by such federal agencies as the Department of Justice, Civil Defense Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Rand Corporation, the private "think factory," which is heavily financed by the federal government.

Kaysen has been a long-time nonresident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

[JAMES] MURRAY KEMPTON was born on December 16, 1918 in Baltimore, son of Sally Ambler and James Kempton. He was married to and divorced from Mina Bluethenthal. His second wife is Beverly Gavy. He is an alumnus of Johns Hopkins University (B.A., 1939). He is the author of *Part of Our Time* (1955) and *America Comes of Middle Age* (1962).

In 1941 and 1942, Kempton was publicity director for the American Labor Party. (The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported: "Communist dissimulation extends into the field of political parties forming political front organizations such as the . . . American Labor Party. The Communists are thus enabled to present their candidates for elective office under other than a straight Communist label.")

In 1942 and 1943, Kempton was a reporter for the leftist-oriented *New York Post.* From 1943 until 1945, he was in the U.S. Army. In 1946 and 1947, he was a reporter for the *Wilmington* (N.C.) *Morning Star.* From 1947 until 1963, he was with the *New York Post* as assistant to the *Post's* labor columnist from 1947 to 1949, and from 1949 to 1963 as labor columnist. In 1963 and 1964, he was editor of the leftist-oriented *New Republic.* From 1964 until 1966, he was a columnist for the *New York World Telegram.* From 1965 until 1969, he was again a columnist for the *New York Post.* Since 1969, he has been a columnist for the leftist-oriented *New York Review of Books.* In 1950, he received the Sidney Hillman Award for reporting, a tribute highly coveted in leftwing circles.

Kempton has been a long-time activist in the socialist League for Industrial Democracy, and a long-time member of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. (James Wechsler, editor of the *New York Post,* testified under oath that in the 1930's Kempton was a member of the Young Communist League.)

Kempton's leftism has been undeniably evident in his writings over the years. But perhaps the best exposition of his ideological position can be found in the remarks he addressed to a 1962 rally of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party"). Said Kempton to the rally, which was also addressed by Communist leaders Gus Hall and Benjamin J. Davis: "I think that the Communist movement through my lifetime, with all its sins and all its terrible troubles, has represented a great ideal. I think America, with all its sins and all its troubles, has represented a great ideal. I think tonight is a night which should be a reconciliation for all of us. And I think of all the people that I have known who have been Communists and who this movement transcended and brought to witness for all mankind in many ways. I think of Pasternak, Djilas; I think of Earl Browder – I think of Gurley Flynn – I think of all those who've endured and fought and kept their faith in a common conception.

"I have known many Communists in my life. I have not known them as criminals. I knew them once as activists – and we had our quarrels. Some day, if you're ever put back on your feet again, I hope we may quarrel again. But in the interim I would like to say this: This country has not been kind to you, but this country has been fortunate in having you. You have been treated as people should not be treated in a civilized society. You have been arrested, you have been followed, you have had your phones bugged, you have had your children fired, you have had everything that can be done to make life as difficult as possible. Throughout this, I can think of numbers of you that I have known who have remained gallant, and pleasant and unbroken. I think your association with those who are victims of trouble and bore their troubles, will someday come to give you a place in history – very unlike the one perhaps that you expected, but not the one that you've been given today.

"I will define it by saying our children's children will some day walk together in the light and they will do it – because numbers of you have done what you could to keep your courage and your patience. And oddly enough, I don't assign that courage and that patience to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine quite so much as to the fact that you are Americans – that you feel that America is part of your heritage, and you feel that America will do right by you and your children as human beings. I salute you and I hope for times to better."

In 1968, Kempton indulged in a rare display of political activism. He was elected a delegate, pledged to the dovish Eugene McCarthy, to the Democratic National Convention. At the site of the convention in Chicago, he demonstrated at the side of racist agitator Dick Gregory. Kempton was arrested and charged with disorderly conduct. In a report written for the ACLU, he stated boldly that he and his fellow demonstrators had sought arrest as "an act of revolt against the Government." Later, when testifying at his trial, he beat a strategic retreat and said that, rather than an act of revolt, he and his fellow demonstrators sought a "withdrawal for the evening from the Government."

GERALD KENNEDY was born on August 30, 1907 in Benzonia, Michigan, son of Marian Phelps and Herbert Kennedy. He married Mary Leeper. He is an alumnus of the College of the Pacific (A.B., 1929); the Pacific School of Religion (A.M., 1929; B.D., 1932); and Hartford Theological Seminary (S.T.M., 1933; Ph.D. 1934). He was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist Church in 1932. He is the author of *His Word Through Preaching* (1947); *Have This Mind* (1948); *The Lion and the Lamb* (1950); *With Singleness of Heart* (1951); *Go Inquire of the Lord* (1952); *If They Be Prophets* (1952); *Heritage and Destiny* (1953); *Who Speaks for God?* (1954); *God is Our Strength* (1954); *God's Good News* (1955); *The Christian and His America* (1956); *The Methodist Way of Life* (1958); *I Believe* (1958); *The Parables* (1960); *The Marks of a Methodist* (1960); *David the King* (1961); *While I'm on My Feet* (1963); *For Preachers and Other Sinners* (1964); *Fresh Every Morning* (1966); *Seven Worlds of the Minister* (1968); and *For Laymen and Other Martyrs* (1969). He is the editor of *The Best of John Henry Jowett* (1948). He is the compiler of *A Reader's Notebook* (1953) and *A Second Reader's Notebook* (1959).

From 1932 until 1948, he held pastorates in Collinsville, Connecticut (1932-1936); in San Jose (1936-1940) and Palo Alto (1940-1942), California; and in Lincoln, Nebraska (1942-1948). From 1938 until 1942, he was acting professor of homiletics at the Pacific School of Religion. From 1948 until 1952, he was bishop of the Methodist Church in the area of Portland, Oregon. Since 1952, he has been bishop of the Methodist Church in the Los Angeles area. He has lectured at Stanford University, Nebraska Wesleyan University, Southern Methodist University, Southwestern University (California), Emory University, DePauw University, Yale University, Duke University, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Union Theological Seminary, Southwestern College (Kansas), Perkins School of Theology, and McKendree College. Since 1969, he has been senior minister at the First Methodist Church in Pasadena, California.

Kennedy has been a long-time active official of the leftist-oriented National Council of Churches. He has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union; the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); and the Churchman Associates, a leftwing group in support of pro-Soviet propaganda. He has long been a foe of anti-Communist investigating committees. He stated at one time that "no person in the United States is safe from character assassination by legislative committees." In 1960, he petitioned the Democratic National Convention to include in the Party's platform a plank calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

LEON KEYSERLING was born on January 22, 1908 in Charleston, South Carolina, son of Jennie Hyman and William Keyserling. He married Mary Dublin. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1928) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1931). He also pursued graduate studies, from 1931 until 1933, at Columbia University. He is the author of *Legal Problems in the Housing Field* (1939); *The Road to Freedom* (1945); *Why the Wagner Act* (1945); *Wages and the Public Interest* (1958); *Inflation: Cause and Cure* (1959); *The Federal Budget and the General Welfare* (1959); *Food and Freedom* (1960); *The Peace by Investment Corporation* (1961); *Poverty and Deprivation in the U.S.* (1962); *Taxes and the Public Interest* (1963); *Two Top Priority Programs to Reduce Unemployment* (1963); *The Toll of Rising Interest Rates* (1964); *Progress or Poverty* (1964); *Agriculture and the Public Interest* (1965); *The Role of Wages in a Great Society* (1966); *Goals for Teachers' Salaries in our Public Schools* (1967); *Achieving Nationwide Educational Excellence* (1968); and *Israel's Economic Progress* (1968).

In 1932 and 1933, Keyserling was an assistant in the department of economics at Columbia University. From 1933 until 1953, he was one of the most prominent leftwing economists and lawyers in the New Deal and Fair Deal Administrations of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. In 1933, he was an attorney in the Red-lined Agricultural Adjustment Administration. From 1933 until 1937, he was secretary and legislative assistant to U.S. Senator Robert F. Wagner, one of the most Socialist-minded members of Congress and author of the Wagner Act, which was, in effect, a blank check for leftwing labor leaders to assume tyrannical power over the nation's economy.

From 1937 until 1946, Keyserling was in the federal government's socialist housing program: general counsel to the U.S. Housing Authority (1937-1938); deputy administrator and general counsel of the U.S. Housing Authority (1938-1942); acting administrator of the U.S. Housing Authority (1941-1942); acting commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority (1942), and general counsel of the National Housing Agency (1942-1946).

In 1946, Keyserling was a charter member of the President's three-man Council of Economic Advisers. From 1946 until 1950, he was vice chairman of the CEA, and was chairman from 1950 until 1953. As chairman, he advised President Truman in 1950 and 1951 to pursue an economic policy of deliberate inflation. To implement the policy, he urged the Federal Reserve System to underwrite Treasury bonds, which, in effect, gave President Truman a printing press from which he could produce unlimited paper money. The resulting chaos caused President Truman to discard the policy within a year's time.

In 1954, Keyserling established and became president of the Conference on Economic Progress, an economic research organization which serves as an outlet for his monographs and as a base for his operations as an economic consultant to private industry, national organizations, and foreign governments. He has also served as a consultant or advisor to the Department of State's Agency for International Development and to U.S. Senate committees and subcommittees dealing with banking and currency, industrial recovery and public works, housing, social security, labor relations, employment, and taxation.

In 1966, Keyserling proclaimed: "I am not for a socialized economy." In fact, however, it would be difficult to imagine any feature of a socialized economy that he has not advocated since his entrance into the New Deal. He has been completely devoted to socialist reforms in housing, education, medicine, transportation, taxation, urban renewal, and employment. In 1962, for example, he prescribed federal measures to guarantee full employment: increase wages, expand public works programs (by at least $3 billion a year), and reduce taxes. He has always been a strong booster for progressive taxation along soak-the-rich lines.

In a single article for *New Republic* in 1967, Keyserling made several statements that are indicative of his long-time commitment to paternalism, statism, centralism, and socialism: "In my judgment, the federal government is not only in a better position than the states to allocate public spending, it is in a stronger position to resist unwholesome pressures toward diversion of tax money to the wrong purposes." – "I regard as meretricious the view that state governments are 'closer to the people' than the federal government, and thus more responsive to their real needs." – "The American people watch what their national government and its leaders are doing much more closely than they watch what their state governments are doing."

Keyserling joined Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He belonged to Franklin Littell's Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the defamatory anti-anti-Communist Anti-Defamation League. In 1968, Keyserling resigned his vice chairmanship of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action when the ADA endorsed the presidential candidacy of Eugene McCarthy. Keyserling accused the ADA of being dominated by a faction that is "pro-McCarthy only because it is anti-Johnson." Keyserling was a strong supporter of Johnson's so-called War on Poverty, and by coincidence, Mrs. Keyserling – an economist in her own right – was a top official in the Johnson Administration's Department of Labor. Keyserling has also been affiliated with Clarence Streit's International Movement for Atlantic Union and the Atlantic Union Committee – two leftist-internationalist groups.

CORETTA KING was born on April 27, 1927 in Heiberger, Alabama, daughter of Obie and Bernice Scott. She married Martin Luther King Jr. She is an alumna of Antioch College (B.S., 1951). On a fellowship, she attended the New England Conservatory of Music for two years.

During the fifteen years when the late Martin L. King Jr. was carrying his anarchism and racism to the mobs, Coretta was frequently at his side in marches and demonstrations. At times she substituted for her husband in speaking engagements. In all respects, she was his ideological echo.

Before and since King's death, Coretta has prated about Gandhi, nonviolence, and civil disobedience. She has invariably injected the element of racism into her remarks on labor, poverty, the Vietnam War, and any other topic she may use to incite an audience to agitate for a "new social order." She has pleaded for amnesty for draft resisters and Army deserters. She has encouraged campus militants in their revolutionary activities. She has given "freedom" concerts in which she lectures, recites poetry, and sings to illustrate the history – distorted, of course – of the so-called civil rights movement.

Coretta has been affiliated with the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, the leftwing-pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, the leftwing-pacifist Jeanette Rankin Brigade, and the leftwing-pacifist Women Strike for Peace. (In 1962, she was a WSP delegate to the 17-nation "disarmament" conference at Geneva.) She is a sponsor of The Committee of Responsibility and of its "call for unilateral withdrawal of United States troops" from Vietnam. She has been a showpiece for the Red-saturated New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee. In 1968, she sent greetings and good wishes to the Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Vietnam, the Communist get-together at Montreal.

After her husband's death, Coretta was named to the board of directors of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which served as Martin L. King's major base for his agitational activities. Even before she became a board member, Coretta, through her "freedom" concerts, was one of the most effective fund raisers for the SCLC.

Coretta has been the recipient of adulation at home and abroad in much the same fashion as her late husband. In 1968, she gave the Class Day address at Harvard University. In 1969, she gave the Founder's Day address at Boston University. In 1969, at New Delhi, she received the Nehru Award for International Understanding. (On the latter occasion she pressed her advantage in the international spotlight to announce her feeling that the social progress of Negroes would slow down under the Nixon Administration. This troubling of racial waters occurred just four days after Nixon was inaugurated.)

In 1968, Coretta was named Woman of the Year by the National Association of Television and Radio Announcers. The next year she received the $16,000 Antonio Feltrinelli Prize for humanitarian work by Italy's Accademia del Lincei. Also in 1969, her memoirs were serialized in *Life* magazine and published by Holt, Rinehart & Winston in book form under a contract for a reported half million dollars. During 1968 and 1969, she made several lucrative appearances at Washington (D.C.) National Symphony concerts, where she recited fellow-traveler Aaron Copland's *A Lincoln Portrait.* Her name is a familiar one in various lists of most-admired-women, and she is frequently referred to in the press as "a black Madonna." During the presidential campaign of 1968, Eugene McCarthy announced that if he were elected he would nominate Coretta to be the United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Perhaps Coretta's most dramatic public appearance was on the occasion – less than four weeks after her husband's death – when she spoke in New York's Central Park to a crowd estimated at 60,000. She exhorted her audience, especially the women, to take part in the so-called Poor People's March on Washington in May 1968. At the time, she read what she claimed were her late husband's ten commandments on Vietnam: "Thou shalt not believe in a military victory . . . in a political victory . . . that the Vietnamese love us . . . that the Saigon government has the support of the people . . . that the majority of the South Vietnamese look upon the Viet Cong as terrorists . . . the figures of killed enemies or killed Americans . . . that the generals know best . . . that the enemy's victory means Communism . . . that the world supports the United States. Thou shalt not kill." The Communists were so impressed with Coretta's neo-Mosaicism that they printed the ten shalt-nots, boxed and in large type, in *The Worker.*

ARTHUR KINOY was born on September 20, 1920 in New York City. He is married to Susan Knopf. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1941) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1947).

On February 3, 1965, U.S. Senator James O. Eastland (D.-Miss.), chairman of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, recited Kinoy's record on the floor of the Senate: "In his student days at Harvard, Arthur Kinoy was a member of the national executive committee of the American Student Union, an organization cited as Communist by five different investigating committees. In 1945, he was registered as a member of the American Labor Party ["Communist political front"].

"Later, Kinoy was a representative of the International Workers Order ["subversive and Communist"]. He was attorney for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers Union of America, a Communist-controlled union. He has been connected with various other front groups.

"During the investigation by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of Communist infiltration among American citizens employed by the United Nations, Mr. Kinoy appeared as counsel for one Alfred J. Van Tassel who claimed his fifth amendment privilege in refusing to testify about his Communist Party affiliations.

"Arthur Kinoy took an active part in the defense of Ethel and Julius Rosenberg, who were executed on June 19, 1953, after conviction of atomic espionage. Kinoy made two last-minute efforts to save the Rosenbergs from execution. A motion brought by Mr. Kinoy for Emanuel Bloch on June 18 was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Ryan; and the following day, a motion for a stay of execution pending determination of the motion brought by Mr. Kinoy the previous day was referred to Judge Kaufman by Judge Dimmock. This motion was denied, and another motion to stay the execution pending appeal of the decision was likewise denied.

"Arthur Kinoy was honored by the New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born at a banquet advertised as salute to attorneys. The New York Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is an affiliate of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born ["subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party.]

"In the New York Times of October 3, 1955, at page 21, Arthur Kinoy is listed, together with Frank J. Donner and Marshall Perlin, as attorney for Steve Nelson before the U.S. Supreme Court.

Steve Nelson was a notorious American Communist who was also an international Communist leader.

"In 1958, Arthur Kinoy was associated with the law firm of Donner, Kinoy & Perlin, a firm which received payments from various Communist groups in the 1950's, including the Committee for Justice for Morton Sobell and Labor Youth League.

"According to testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee in April 1959, which has been publicly printed and made public, Arthur Kinoy was at that time listed by Harry Sacher as a member of the law firm of Harry Sacher, Frank Donner, Marshall Perlin, & Milton Friedman, with offices at 342 Madison Avenue, New York City. Both Harry Sacher and Frank Donner have been frequently listed as defending Communist cases.

"Kinoy has been associated with the National Lawyers Guild [“the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"] for a long time. He was national vice president of that organization in 1954. Ten years later, he was still active in the work of the National Lawyers Guild. He recently served as vice president at the National Lawyers Guild Convention in Detroit. The June 13, 1964, issue of the *Michigan Chronicle*, a weekly Detroit newspaper in the Negro community, reported Kinoy as having participated in a conference sponsored by the National Lawyers Guild Committee for Legal Assistance in the South, the purpose of the conference being to brief attorneys on legal problems confronting civil rights demonstrators in Mississippi. The news story to which I have referred indicated that those who attended the conference volunteered to go to Mississippi to defend any demonstrators who might encounter legal difficulties.

" . . . Kinoy was named as one of the three who guide the legal affairs of the [Mississippi] Freedom Party [of racial agitators]."

Since 1964, Kinoy has been a professor of law at Rutgers University. From 1964 until 1967, he was a partner in the law firm of Kunstler, Kunstler & Kinoy of New York City. He has been counsel for the radical-leftist Students for a Democratic Society and the leftist Southern Conference Educational Fund. He has been affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"). In 1966, he was a speaker at the annual dinner of the Communists' *National Guardian.* He has done legal work for the radical-leftist American Civil Liberties Union.

In 1966, Kinoy's disruptive conduct during a hearing of the House Committee on Un-American Activities resulted in his ejection from the hearing room and subsequent conviction for disorderly conduct. In 1968, the U.S. Court of Appeals overturned the conviction.

In recent years, Kinoy has been active in the Law Center for Constitutional Rights, an organization of lawyers committed to provide free legal aid for campus revolutionaries and black militants.

EVRON KIRKPATRICK was born on August 15, 1911 in Raub, Indiana, son of Lenna Hain and Omer Kirkpatrick. He married Jeane Jordan. He is an alumnus of the University of Illinois (B.A., 1932; M.A., 1933) and Yale University (Ph.D., 1939). He is the author of *American Government* (1942); *Survey of American Government* (1943); *Target, the World: Communist Propaganda Activities in 1955* (1956); and *Year of*

Crisis: An Analysis of Communist Propaganda Activities in 1956 (1957). He is the co-author of *Running the Country* (1946); *Elections – USA* (1956); and *The People, Politics, and the Politician* (1941, 1950, and 1953). He is a contributor to *Man and Society* (1938); *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics* (1962); and *Perspectives* (1963).

From 1935 until 1948, Kirkpatrick was on the faculty at the University of Minnesota: as instructor of political science (1935-1939); assistant professor (1939-1943); associate professor (1943-1948); chairman of the social science division (1944-1948); and professor (1948).

Kirkpatrick's years at Minnesota overlapped his years in government service. In 1945, he was an assistant research director in the research and analysis branch of the Office of Strategic Services. From 1946 until 1954, he was with the Department of State: as assistant research director and projects control officer for Research and Intelligence (1946); intelligence program adviser (1947); chief of the external research staff (1948-1952); chief psychologist of the intelligence and research staff (1952-1954); and deputy director of the Office of Intelligence Research (1954).

From 1952 until 1960, Kirkpatrick was an editorial adviser on political science for Henry Holt & Company, and since 1960, for its successor organization, Holt, Rinehart and Winston Company. From 1957 until 1961, he lectured at Howard University. Since 1959, he has been a professorial lecturer at Georgetown University. Since 1955, he has been president of Operations and Policy Research, Incorporated – a "think factory" specializing in research related to government and the social sciences. From 1954 until 1964, he was a director of the Governmental Affairs Institute, a research group financed by the Department of State and by various foundations. From 1963 until 1966, he was a member of the division of behavioral sciences, and since 1966, has been a member of the committee on international relations in the behavorial sciences within the National Academy of Sciences – National Research Council – a quasi-official agency of the federal government.

Kirkpatrick has been a long-time associate of Hubert Humphrey, who was his student at the University of Minnesota. Kirkpatrick introduced Humphrey to the teaching profession in 1940, and since that time has been a close political adviser to Humphrey. Along with Max Kampelman, Kirkpatrick helped Humphrey in his successful campaigns for Mayor of Minneapolis and for the U.S. Senate. (Kirkpatrick and Kampelman, both cronies of Humphrey, have shared many experiences: both taught political science at the University of Minnesota; both lectured at Howard University; both are officers of the Helen Dwight Reid Educational Foundation; both are trustees of the Institute for American Universities; both have been officials of Operations & Policy Research, Incorporated; and both have influenced Humphrey with their left-of-center political views.)

Since 1954, Kirkpatrick has been the executive director of the leftist-oriented American Political Science Association. He is also the director of the American Peace Society ("To advance judicial methods and other peaceful means of avoiding and adjusting differences between nations").

GEORGE B. KISTIAKOWSKY was born on November 18, 1900 in Kiev, the

Ukraine, son of Mary Berenstam and Bogdan Kistiakowsky. He came to the United States in 1926 and was naturalized in 1933. He was married to and divorced from Hildegard Moebius. His second wife was the late Irma Shuler. His third wife is Elaine Mahoney. He is an alumnus of the University of Berlin (Ph.D., 1925).

From 1926 until 1930, Kistiakowsky was at Princeton University, as international research fellow (1926-1928) and research associate (1928-1930). Since 1930, he has been at Harvard University continuously, except for years in government service: as assistant professor of chemistry (1930-1933); associate professor (1933-1937); professor (1937-1959; 1961 to the present); and chairman of the chemistry department (1947-1950).

From 1940 until 1945, Kistiakowsky worked on the development of explosives for the National Defense Research Committee and on the development of the A-bomb in the Manhattan Project. From 1953 until 1958, he was a member of the ballistic missiles advisory committee of the Department of Defense; he participated in the 1954 decision to accelerate the development of the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile. From 1959 until 1961, he was a Special Assistant to President Eisenhower for Science and Technology. At the same time, he was chairman of the President's Science Advisory Committee and chairman of the Federal Council for Science and Technology. From 1959 until 1968, he was on the research advisory committee on chemical energy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Since his days with the Manhattan Project, Kistiakowsky has belonged to that bloc of American scientists who have a dread, genuine or feigned, of nuclear warfare. Whatever their motivation, they persist in urging that the United States diplomatic establishment seek accommodation with the Soviet Union, especially through the treaty-making processes. They have a general distrust of the American military, but a deep trust in the Soviets' promises as expressed in treaties. They accept Soviet and Red Chinese claims to scientific accomplishments at face value. They use their prestige as scientists to promote their left-of-center political and sociological views.

During Kistiakowsky's tenure as President Eisenhower's chief science advisor, the United States maintained a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear testing. The suspension of nuclear tests was in complete contradiction to the best possible sources of advice. Dr. Edward Teller ("father of the H-bomb"), General Nathan Twining (Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff), and Lewis L. Strauss (Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission) argued strenuously, but to no avail, for the continuance of testing as a matter vital to national security.

Kistiakowsky participated in highly secretive talks between American scientists and Soviet "scientists" that paved the way for the so-called test-ban treaty of 1963. The treaty, vigorously opposed by experienced American military leaders, was a major step toward complete accommodation with the Soviet Union.

In 1964, during the presidential campaign, Kistiakowsky was an organizer of Scientists and Engineers for Johnson. In *Science* magazine of March 1, 1968, it was reported that Kistiakowsky had "quietly severed his connections with the Department of Defense because of his opposition to the administration's Vietnam policies." The author of the report, D.S. Greenberg, made some inspired observations on the move by

Kistiakowsky: " . . . Against a background of worsening relations between the academic world and the military, Kistiakowsky's action has at least great symbolic significance – and possibly more. For if there is a 'scientific establishment' Kistiakowsky is at the very heart of it, and it may be speculated that if Kistiakowsky, noted for his prudence and conservatism, is disaffected over Vietnam, disaffection may be massive indeed in the senior councils of science . . . . His departure from high Defense councils not only removes one of the Department's most seasoned and respected advisers but also contributes to a problem that DOD prefers not to talk about – namely, the increasing difficulty that it is having in attracting top-level scientific talent to work on military matters. Elder statesmen, such as Kistiakowsky, have generally confined their efforts to providing high-level policy advice, but also they often serve as talent scouts for bringing bright young men into defense research. And even when they don't do that, their very presence in the Defense advisory network provides a luster and prestige that DOD finds useful."

Kistiakowsky declined to comment on his self-initiated severance from the Defense Department, but D.S. Greenberg again displayed his flair for inspired observations: "*Science* has learned that, early this year, Kistiakowsky wrote to [John S.] Foster [Director of Defense Research and Engineering] to express his concerns about the administration's course of action in Vietnam and, at approximately the same time, resigned from a secret Defense Department committee that had been created to provide advice on the construction of an anti-infiltration barrier in Vietnam. Last year Kistiakowsky was in Washington full time for long periods over several months, for work related to the barrier. In his letter to Foster, it is understood, Kistiakowsky stated that he had accepted the committee assignment because he felt that the barrier would contribute to a de-escalation of the fighting in Vietnam. It is said, however, that he since has become disillusioned about the intentions of the Johnson administration, and that in his letter to Foster he stated that he wished to devote himself to activities that he felt would be more fruitful for reducing the conflict . . . . Following his resignation from the Defense Department committee, Kistiakowsky is understood to have written letters to several dozen colleagues to express his concern about the war in Vietnam and the effects it was having on the availability of resources for dealing with domestic problems."

When Kistiakowsky wrote his letter of resignation in early 1968, he was merely playing the same role that other leftwing academicians, scientists, and politicians had been playing under the direction of such doves as J. William Fulbright, Martin L. King, James M. Gavin, George McGovern, and Eugene McCarthy. The script for their play acting was hackneyed but effective: Lyndon Johnson, no matter his protestations that he sought no military victory, was charged with seeking a punitive and ruthless conquest in the Vietnam War; the war expenditures were described as depriving millions of Americans – especially "minority" groups – of jobs, housing, education, and welfare handouts; and the National Liberation Front (the Viet Cong) was repeatedly portrayed as a legitimate political entity, distinct from the North Vietnam regime and independent of the great powers of the Communist bloc, Red China and the Soviet Union.

In December 1967, Kistiakowsky, at the behest of President Joseph E. Johnson of the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, joined such well-known leftists as Adam Yarmolinsky, Harding Bancroft, Ernest Gross, Charles Yost, Roger Hilsman, and Milton Katz in sending a memorandum to President Lyndon Johnson. The memorandum appeared in the *New York Times* on January 17, 1968, about six weeks before Kistiakowsky's resignation from the Defense Department became public knowledge. The signatories had held a meeting in Bermuda in December under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment. The memorandum contained much hand-wringing over escalation of the U.S. war effort, which it said could result in an invasion of North Vietnam and possibly cause the Soviet Union and Red China to intervene directly on the side of North Vietnam. The United States was urged to shift its strategy from "search-and-destroy" to "clear-and-hold" operations. "To shift international pressures from Washington to Hanoi," the United States was advised to cease bombing of North Vietnam. Most important, the memorandum contended that the United States should seek political avenues for negotiations with the National Liberation Front (the memorandum was merely a restatement of left-wing, peacenik arguments that had been bruited about for months prior to the Carnegie Endowment's grab for publicity.)

In the spring of 1969, Kistiakowsky joined the furor against the Nixon Administration's plans to increase the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system of defense. Kistiakowsky demonstrated his willingness to regard the scientific-military capabilities of the Soviet Union and Red China as equal to or greater than the United States.' In his statement of the controversy (printed in the March 21, 1969 issue of *Science* magazine), he followed the scare-mongering arguments that were used whenever the appeasers were making a major step in their drive for disarmament. In full context, Kistiakowsky appeared to hold that the best defense against Red China-Soviet Union capabilities (or the best hope for a durable peace) was fear of an arms race: "It seems reasonable to assert that an attack on the United States by a modest force of ICBM's which the People's Republic of China is likely to deploy sometime in the seventies is wholly irrational, since it would invite a retaliatory blow which would totally destroy China. If none-the-less the Chinese decide to attack, they would certainly be capable of adding some penetration aids to their ICBM's if, as assumed, they would have the technical and other resources to deploy a significant ICBM force. For an irrational action such as we are hypothesizing the certainty that penetration aids will succeed would not be required and hence the presence of Sentinel might not be a deterrent. The Chinese, of course, could also use other means than ICBM's for an irrational nuclear attack in which case Sentinel might be of no use. Thus the basing of the United States policies on the assumption that Sentinel would prevent large American casualties in the case of a Chinese attack in the seventies would not be very prudent. On the other hand, the deployment of the Sentinel, especially in the mode begun last fall, foreshortens greatly the lead time for a conversion of it to a heavy ABM deployment. This the Soviet military planner would have to take into account and thus the likelihood of an all-out missile race between the super-powers might increase.

"Another form of ABM deployment has contemplated the exclusive defense of our hardened missile sites. Under proper circumstances such a move would not be inviting an arms race and could in fact stabilize mutual deterrence by protecting the retaliatory force against a preemptive strike. It is highly doubtful, however, considering the present threat, whether such deployment need be started immediately. Furthermore the Sentinel system is over-designed for this application, since the intercept of incoming warheads could take place much nearer to hardened Minuteman silos than to cities and the probability of kill of the incoming warheads could be relaxed. Thus, for instance, an interceptor of shorter range and less acceleration than the Spirit could be largely employed and other simplifying changes made. To avoid the dangers of the arms race that I have already discussed, the defense of missile sites must be unambiguously designed just for this purpose.

"Having followed the development of weapon systems over the past quarter of a century, I cannot remain unaware of the very substantial momentum that a technological development of the magnitude of our ABM creates. I am therefore concerned that even a limited deployment would be open-ended and, with assembly lines operating, could lead to a continuously expanding system, which would obviously be a stimulus to a heightened arms race . . . . "

In 1969, when the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the United States and Soviet Union delegates were getting under way in Helsinki, the *New York Times* called upon Kistiakowsky for his expert evaluation of SALT's prospects. Although completely devoid of diplomatic experience, Kistiakowsky regarded the Soviets as trustworthy negotiators whose yearning for peace was equivalent to that of their American counterparts: "Hopefully, SALT will create understanding between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. that thermonuclear war between them is an unacceptable policy choice because it would mean the destruction of both societies. With this awareness, both sides will realize that neither is preparing for a pre-emptive attack. This would permit agreement on freezing the numbers and types of offensive weapons at about current levels and on minimal deployments of ABM defenses – thus recognizing the inevitable effectiveness of retaliatory strikes.

"However, unless a moratorium on MIRV [multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles] testing is quickly established (which would require that the political leaders overrule the military), mutual suspicion of preparations for pre-emptive attack will prevail, and deployments of more advanced offensive and defensive weapons systems will continue.

"Thus the pessimistic and unfortunately more realistic estimate is that SALT will not stop the strategic arms race. It might slow the race through self-restraining action based on better understanding of the adversary."

Kistiakowsky returned to the subject of SALT in the January 1970 issue of *Scientific American,* to which, in collaboration with G.W. Rathjens, he contributed an article, "The Limitation of Strategic Arms." In the course of the article, Kistiakowsky's respect for Soviet reasonableness, his contempt for the judgment of American military leaders, his willingness to take grave technical and military risks in U.S.-Soviet Union agreements, and his anxiety for speedy results at Helsinki were in great evidence. Repeatedly, he offered the scaremongering bogey of nuclear warfare between the "superpowers." But what was most revealing in his pleading was his optimistic expectation that President Richard Nixon, with the image of a conservative, could achieve in the SALT negotiations what would be impossible for a liberal Democratic president.

Stripped of its convolutions, Kistiakowsky's major argument for rapprochement with the Soviet Union through the SALT talks indicated that he considered himself and like-minded appeasers to be an elite in the realm of diplomatic, political, and military competence. The elite, to the satisfaction of Kistiakowsky, seemed to have a witting or unwitting ally in President Nixon. Wrote Kistiakowsky and his collaborator in the heart of their article: "As the failure of American policy in Southeast Asia and its implications become apparent, it seems likely that there will be a sharp reaction in an important segment of American society, with the polarization of attitudes proceeding even further than it has in the past year or two. It will be a difficult time for arms-control negotiations. Indeed, the strategic-arms-limitation talks are likely to be a divisive factor in the same way that the recent debate on the Safeguard ABM system was.

"The situation in the U.S.S.R., although less clear, seems no more promising. The controversy between China and the U.S.S.R. might lead one to expect that accommodation and cooperation with the West would be increasingly attractive to the Russian leadership. But that controversy, like the recent Russian difficulties in eastern Europe, is also likely to be a factor in reinforcing the trend toward orthodoxy and conservatism within the U.S.S.R., which is hardly a favorable augury for an arms-control agreement.

"Thus for SALT to be successful will require not only that the two governments be sincere in approaching the talks but also that they be prepared to display leadership and steadfastness of purpose in dealing with domestic opposition. On both sides there will have to be a rejection of many of the premises on which military policy has been at least partially based for two decades, for example the importance of 'superiority' in strategic strength, the concept of 'winning' a thermonuclear war, and the view that one can build meaningful defenses against a thermonuclear attack. The leadership in each nation will be confronted with arguments about the great risks inherent in various kinds of agreement – barely feasible (or at least not provably unfeasible) developments that might be taken advantage of by an adversary. Such arguments will undoubtedly resemble those to which the Kennedy Administration had to respond, when in connection with the nuclear-test-ban treaty it was asserted that the U.S.S.R. might conduct nuclear tests behind the moon or behind the sun to our great disadvantage. If agreement is to be reached, such arguments will have to be judged for what they are: nightmares of people who have focused so narrowly on such problems that they simply lack the perspective for weighing the risks of agreement against the risks implicit in continuing the arms race without any agreed constraints.

"In the case of the U.S. the President will have a special problem and a formidable challenge, perhaps the greatest faced by any American leader since President Wilson's effort at the end of

World War I to gain acceptance for his views regarding the Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. Although most Americans, including probably a majority of those who supported President Nixon in his campaign for the Presidency, would support him in his efforts to reach an arms-control agreement, almost certainly the conservative wing of the President's political supporters will counsel him to exercise extreme caution in approaching SALT. In so doing this latter group will give unwarranted weight to the technical and military risks that might be involved in any agreement under consideration. It is equally certain that the military will attempt to influence him with similar arguments, both through its direct channels and through its Congressional allies.

"It is inconceivable that any meaningful agreement can be reached if the views of these groups should prevail. They need not, of course. Exercising broader judgment, the President can reject such advice and, as suggested above, draw on very substantial nationwide support for an agreement. Should he choose to do so, he will be in a better position to make his decision politically acceptable than would have been the case for any of his recent predecessors, or for that matter for his opponent in the last election. There is almost certainly a sizable segment of the American body politic that could accept a decision by President Nixon to conclude a very far-reaching agreement as a result of SALT that would not accept a similar position were it offered by, say, a liberal Democratic president."

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK was born on July 9, 1907 in Kansas City, Missouri, son of Minnie Spindler and Morris Klutznick. He married Ethel Riekes. He studied at the University of Kansas (1924-1925) and the University of Nebraska (1925-1926). He is an alumnus of Creighton University (LL.B., 1929).

Since 1930, Klutznick has maintained a private law practice, interrupted periodically by his positions in public service. In 1933 and 1934, he was a deputy corporation counsel for the City of Omaha. In 1935 and 1936, he was a special attorney in the Department of Justice. In 1942 and 1943, he was a regional representative for the National Housing Agency. In 1943, he became assistant administrator for the NHA. From 1944 until 1946, he was commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority. In 1957 and 1961, he was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations. From 1961 until 1963, he was a United States representative, with ambassadorial rank, to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

In the business world, Klutznick has been president of American Community Builders, Pennsylvania Consumers Oil Company, Omaha Fixture and Supply Company, and the Oak Brook Utility Company. He has been chairman of the board of Urban Investment and Development Company, American Bank and Trust Company, and Swiss-Israel Trade Bank of Switzerland, and he has been a director and/or trustee of numerous business, educational, and philanthropic organizations.

Klutznick has been affiliated with the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); the United Nations Association of the United States (the main leftist propaganda arm for the UN); the National Council for Civic Responsibility (an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-

Communists); Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union (two leftist, one-world groups); and the Foreign Policy Association (a pivotal agency for pro-Communist, one-world propaganda).

O.A. KNIGHT was born on September 24, 1902 in New Hampton, Iowa, son of Clara Ransom and William Knight. He married Evelyn Dokken.

From 1926 until 1937, Knight was an oil refinery worker in Indiana. From 1937 until 1940, he was a staff representative for the Oil Workers International Union, and from 1940 until 1955, he was president of the union. In 1953, he became president of the International Federation of Petroleum Workers, and in 1955, president of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union. He has been a vice president of the CIO and the AFL-CIO.

Knight has been affiliated with the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); the United World Federalists (the most prestigious group of fellow travelers and dupes working for world government at the expense of American sovereignty); Sidney Hillman's Red-loaded Political Action Committee; and Clarence Streit's complex of leftist, one-world groups: Federal Union, the International Movement for Atlantic Union, and the Atlantic Union Committee. He sponsored a dinner held under the auspices of *Soviet Russia Today* to honor the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army. He has been on the national board of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action.

HANS KOHN was born on September 15, 1891 in Prague, Czecho-Slovakia, son of Berta Fischer and Solomon Kohn. He married Yetty Wahl. He is an alumnus of the University of Prague (D.J., 1923). He came to the United States in 1933. He is the author of *Orient and Occident* (1934); *Western Civilization in the Near East* (1936); *Force or Reason* (1938); *Revolutions and Dictatorships* (1939); *Not By Arms Alone* (1940); *The World Must Federate* (1940); *World Order in Historical Perspective* (1941); *The Idea of Nationalism* (1944 and 1961); *Prophets and Peoples* (1946); *The Twentieth Century* (1949); *Pan-Slavism: Its History and Ideology* (1953); *The Future of Austria* (1955); *Making of the Modern French Mind* (1955); *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History* (1955); *Nationalism and Liberty: The Swiss Example* (1956); *Basic History of Modern Russia* (1957); *American Nationalism* (1957); *Is the Liberal West in Decline?* (1957); *West Germany: New Era for German People* (1958); *The Mind of Germany* (1960); *The Habsburg Monarchy: 1804-1918* (1961); *The Age of Nationalism* (1962); *Reflections on Modern History* (1963); *Living in a World Revolution* (1964); *Nationalism in the Atlantic Community* (1965); *Absolutism and Democracy* (1965); *Prelude to Nation-States* (1967); *Nationalism and Realism* (1967); and *Europe in Crisis: 1850-1914* (1969). He has contributed articles to *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, and the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences.*

From 1925 until 1933, Kohn was the Middle East correspondent for *Frank-*

furter Zeitung and *Neve Zuercher Zeitung.* From 1933 until 1961, he was a lecturer at the ultra-radical New School for Social Research. From 1934 until 1949, he was a professor of history at Smith College. From 1949 until 1962, he was a professor of history at the City College of New York. He became professor emeritus in 1962. He has lectured at Harvard University, the University of California, the University of Colorado, Radcliffe College, Mt. Holyoke College, Grinnell College, the University of Chicago, Dartmouth College, the University of Buffalo, Ohio Wesleyan University, Northwestern University, the University of Denver, Yale University, the Fletcher School of Diplomacy at Tufts University, Wesleyan University, St. Joseph's College, the New Jersey College for Women, and the University of Texas. In 1940, he held a Guggenheim fellowship. In 1948 and 1955, he was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, New Jersey. In 1963 and 1964, he held a fellowship at the Center for Advanced Study at Wesleyan University in Connecticut. In 1968 and 1969, he was a Fulbright professor at Berlin's Free University. He has lectured at various American and Canadian armed forces schools. He has lectured at various German universities, under the auspices of the U.S. Information Service. From 1955 until 1966, he was a member of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania.

Kohn's leftist-one worldism has been expressed in his writings and through his affiliations with Clarence Streit's leftist one-world complex: Federal Union, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the International Movement for Atlantic Union. He has also been a member and non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

MILTON R. KONVITZ was born on March 12, 1908 in Safad, Palestine, son of Welia Ridvas-Wilowsky and Joseph Konvitz. He was brought to the United States in 1915 and naturalized in 1926. He married Mary Traub. He is an alumnus of New York University (B.S., 1928; A.M. and J.D., 1930) and Cornell University (Ph.D., 1933). He is the author of *On the Nature of Value* (1946); *The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law* (1946); *The Constitution and Civil Rights* (1947); *Civil Rights in Immigration* (1953); *Bill of Rights Reader* (1954); *Fundamental Liberties of a Free People* (1957); *A Century of Civil Rights* (1961); *First Amendment Freedoms* (1963); *Expanding Liberties* (1966); and *Religious Liberty and Conscience* (1968). He is the co-editor of *Freedom and Experience* (1947); *Essays in Political Theory* (1948); *Aspects of Liberty* (1958); *American Pragmatists* (1960); and *Emerson: Twentieth Century Views* (1962). He is a member of the editorial board of *New Leader,* a socialist journal.

From 1933 until 1946, Konvitz practiced law in Jersey City and Newark. From 1938 until 1946, he lectured on law and public administration at New York University. From 1944 until 1946, he lectured at the leftist-oriented New School for Social Research. Since 1946, he has been at the New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations at Cornell University, as associate professor of industrial and labor relations from 1946 to 1949, and since 1949, as professor. In 1953 and 1954, he was a Guggenheim fellow. In 1955, he was a Fund for the Republic fellow. Since 1956, he has been a professor of law at Cornell University's Law School. In 1959 and 1960, he was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, New Jersey. In 1964 and 1965, he was a fellow of the Center for Advanced Study of Behavioral Sciences.

Away from the campus, Konvitz has held a variety of positions in government: general counsel for the Newark Housing Authority (1938-1943); general counsel for the New Jersey Housing Authority (1943-1945); public representative for the National War Labor Board (1943-1946); hearing commissioner for the National Wage Stabilization Board (1952-1953); and member of the New York Advisory Commission of the Federal Civil Rights Commission (1958-1962). He has also been a panel member of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the New York State Mediation Board, and the New York Public Employment Relations Board.

Konvitz has been a national committeeman for the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. He has been a national legal committeeman for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century. He has served as director of the Workers Defense League, a leftist group defending political undesirables who are subject to deportation.

WILLIAM KUNSTLER was born on July 7, 1919 in New York City, son of Frances Mandelbaum and Monroe Kunstler. He married Lotte Rosenberger. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1941) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1948). In 1948, he was admitted to the New York bar and, in 1958, to the District of Columbia bar.

In 1948 and 1949, Kunstler was an executive trainee at R.H. Macy & Co. in New York City. From 1946 until 1950, he was a lecturer in English at Columbia University and also a book reviewer for the *New York Times,* the *New York Herald Tribune,* and other publications. Since 1949, he has been a partner in the law firm of Kunstler and Kunstler (later: Kunstler, Kunstler & Kinoy). Since 1950, he has been an associate professor of law at New York Law School, and since 1951, he has been on the law faculty of Pace College. He has been a lecturer at the New School for Social Research since 1966. (His academic activities have been of a part-time nature.) He is the author of *The Law of Accidents* (1954), *First Degree* (1960), *Beyond a Reasonable Doubt?* (1961), *The Case for Courage* (1962), *And Justice for All* (1963), *The Minister and the Choir Singer* (1964), and *Deep in My Heart* (1966). The New York State Bar Association gave him its "press award" in 1957 and its "civil rights award" in 1963.

In 1961, Kunstler embarked on a career of revolutionary political and civil rights agitation. Within a decade his legal clients included such racist agitators as Martin Luther King Jr., Stokely Carmichael, Adam Clayton Powell, H. Rap Brown, and such radical revolutionaries as Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, and David Dellinger.

Kunstler's affiliations have included the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party"); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the

Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); and the Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell ("a Communist Party enterprise").

In 1961, Kunstler went to Mississippi at the request of the American Civil Liberties Union, which was involved in the legal defense of the so-called Freedom Riders, a group of racial agitators. Out of this experience, Kunstler became general counsel for the Council of Federated Organizations, which was originally composed of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, and the Congress of Racial Equality – all of which were creating racial strife in the southern states. He became active in the Law Center for Constitutional Rights, a collection of leftwing lawyers who specialized in "civil rights" cases. He became general counsel for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, the racial agitators who caused so much turmoil in the 1964 Democratic National Convention. By 1965, Kunstler had risen so high in the echelons of the left that he was a featured speaker at the Communists' *National Guardian's* seventeenth-anniversary dinner. And, along the way, Kunstler has been counsel for Students for a Democratic Society, the Black Panthers, and the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs – all of which are firmly entrenched in the militant left.

In 1966, Kunstler and his partner, Arthur Kinoy, appeared as legal counsel for witnesses in House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings. Kinoy was ejected from the hearing room after creating a tumult. Kunstler stalked out of the hearing in sympathy with Kinoy, who was later found guilty of disorderly conduct. In 1968, Kunstler was again involved in HCUA hearings that were repeatedly disrupted by his clients, several lawyers, and Kunstler himself, who was finally ejected from the hearing room.

In 1969 and 1970, Kunstler was a defense attorney in the trial of the "Chicago Seven," who were charged with traveling in interstate commerce to incite a riot at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The conduct of Kunstler during the course of the trial led to his being sentenced to four years and thirteen days for contempt of court.

After sentence was passed, Kunstler – out on bail – began speaking to collegiate and other audiences about the country. In the wake of his appearances, violent demonstrations occurred. (In Santa Barbara, California, within hours after Kunstler spoke at the local campus of the University of California, a branch of the Bank of America in Santa Barbara was burned to the ground by a mob of students. Kunstler, in a speech to five thousand students, had called upon his audience to make the "Chicago Seven" a symbol. Said Kunstler: "We have to show the so-called establishment a voice that's strong and clear and then they'll have to judge their future course accordingly." The students responded to Kunstler's harangue with four nights of riots that were subdued only after five hundred national guardsmen, armed with rifles and fixed bayonets, were placed on duty in Santa Barbara.)

On April 5, 1970, Kunstler spoke to a crowd of students at Boston University. He called upon his audience to help stop the murder-conspiracy trial of Black Panther Bobby Seale in New Haven. "I know the newspapers will say I'm telling you to put the country into the throes of revolution," Kunstler protested, "but I'm not calling for violence." In other remarks, however, it was not unreasonable to suspect that Kunstler's audience could interpret him as calling for something more than non-violence: "Take any stand you deem necessary and that doesn't mean just holding a picket sign – that was yesterday's way of redressing issues." – "Bobby Seale's trial poses a severe test for young people because it will have an aura of death about it. If Bobby is sentenced to death that is the signal that resistance is going to be paid for by death. Tomorrow is not a day for picket lines. It is not a day for routinized demonstrations. It is a day for resistance." – "If one step won't bring a response, you go on to the next step. If that doesn't bring a response you go on to revolution."

After virtually calling upon his student audience to bring militancy to New Haven, Kunstler – in a press conference – said that he didn't want to give the students detailed instructions on how to prevent the trial of Seale from taking place: "I am a lawyer, not a political leader. It would be presumptuous of me to schedule a blueprint for these demonstrations." (No newsman at Kunstler's press conference bothered to inquire as to what legal aspects were involved in asking students to travel across state lines to prevent a trial from taking place.)

FRANCIS J. LALLY was born on June 11, 1918 in Swampscott, Massachusetts, son of Catherine Farragher and Frank Lally. He is an alumnus of Boston College (A.B., 1940) and Laval University (L.S.S., 1948). In 1944, he completed studies at St. John's Seminary and was ordained a Roman Catholic priest. In 1959, he was named a Domestic Prelate (Monsignor).

From 1946 until 1952, Lally was associate editor of *The Pilot,* official organ of the Archdiocese of Boston. Since 1952, he has been editor of *The Pilot.* In political and international affairs, he has maintained an editorial policy marked by a liberalism closely akin to such secular journals as the *New York Times,* the *Boston Globe,* and the *Washington Post.*

Lally has been an active member of the United States Committee for UNESCO and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO – two groups committed to support of UN agencies dominated by Communists and others of the ultra-left. He has been a long-time director of the Fund for the Republic and its offshoot, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, which have made magnanimous contributions to Socialism in America and abroad. He has been a member of the NAACP's Legal Defense and Educational Fund, the legal arm of the militant civil rights movement. (In 1963, Lally took part in the March on Washington. He was especially enraptured by the leftist leaders of that spectacle. In *The Pilot* of August 31, 1963, he wrote: "Surely we will be remembering for many years the phrases that filled our heads and hearts from the various orators. Dr. [Eugene Carson] Blake's humility and strength; Walter Reuther's intelligence and fire; John Lewis' youth and alarm. But the greatest of them all made an unforgettable ceremony a part of the history of the nation – Martin Luther King. On Wednesday he was a king as never before!")

From 1961 until 1970, Lally was chairman of the Boston Redevelopment Authority with its extravagant and socialistic programs that have gouged taxpayers and deprived people of their homes and businesses.

WILLIAM L. LANGER was born on March 16, 1896 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Johanna Rockenbach and Charles Langer. His first wife was Susanne Knauth. His second wife is Rowena Nelson. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1915; A.M., 1920; Ph.D., 1923). In 1921 and 1922, he studied at the University of Vienna. He is the author of *The Franco-Russian Alliance: 1890-1894* (1929); *European Alliances and Alignments: 1871-1890* (1931); and *The Diplomacy of Imperialism: 1890-1902* (1935). He is the co-author of *Foreign Affairs Bibliography: 1919-1932* (1933); *The Challenge of Isolation: 1937-1940* (1952); and *The Undeclared War: 1940-1941* (1953).

From 1923 until 1927, Langer was at Clark University: assistant professor of history (1923-1925) and associate professor (1925-1927). From 1927 until 1964, he was at Harvard University: assistant professor of history (1927-1931); associate professor (1931-1936); and professor (1936-1964). In 1964, he became professor emeritus. At Harvard, he was director of the Russian Research Center and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies (1954-1959) and a fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences (1959-1960). He has been a visiting lecturer at the University of Chicago, Columbia University, Yale University, and the Fletcher School of Diplomacy at Tufts University.

In 1941 and 1942, Langer was a member of the board of analysts in the Office of Coordinator of Information which, in 1942, became the Red-saturated Office of Strategic Services. From 1942 until 1945, he was the chief of the Research and Analysis Branch of the Office of Strategic Services. (After World War II, Langer retained connections with "spook" activities. In 1950 and 1951, he was assistant director of national estimates in the Central Intelligence Agency. And he has been a member of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board – a watchdog for the CIA – established by President Kennedy after the Bay of Pigs fiasco.)

Langer collaborated with Sarell E. Gleason in producing *The Challenge of Isolation* and *The Undeclared War.* (From 1943 until 1945, Gleason served in the Office of Strategic Services, and from 1950 until 1959, was executive secretary of the National Security Council.) When the Langer-Gleason team was working on the two books, Gleason was an historian with the Council on Foreign Relations. Their venture came to the attention of the House Special Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (the Reece Committee of 1954), which said in its December 16, 1954 Report: "It must be kept in mind that the evils attendant on permitting propaganda by any individual foundation multiply geometrically when there is unified or combined or similar action by a group of foundations . . . . The Rockefeller Foundation and some of its associates also entered this field of propaganda.

"Professor Harry Elmer Barnes in his *The Struggle Against the Historical Blackout,* said: 'The readjustment of historical writing to historical facts relative to background and causes of the first World War – what is popularly known in the historical craft as "Revisionism" – was the most important development in historiography during the decade of the 1920's.'

"Wars in this day and age are accompanied by the perversion of history to suit a propaganda thesis. Historians know this. Many of them, in a spirit of patriotism, misguided or not, lend themselves to this propaganda process. Whether they are ethically justified in this, is gravely questionable. It certainly becomes their duty, however, to revise their contorted historical emanations after propaganda reason for perversion has ceased to be in any way useful. This most of them seem not to do.

"Where have the foundations fitted into this picture? The Council on Foreign Relations, an organization supported by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and others, made up its mind that no 'revisionism' was to be encouraged after World War II. The following is an extract from the 1946 Report of the Rockefeller Foundation, referring to the Council's work: 'The Committee on Studies of the Council on Foreign Relations is concerned that the debunking journalistic campaign following World War I should not be repeated and believes that the American public deserves a clear and competent statement of our basic aims and activities during the second World War.'

"Accordingly, a three-volume history of the War was to be prepared under the direction of Professor William Langer of Harvard, in which (one must gather this from the use of the term 'debunking') no revisionism was to appear. In other words, the official propaganda of World War II was to be perpetuated and the public was to be protected against learning the truth. As Professor Charles Austin Beard put it: 'In short, they hope that, among other things, the policies and measures of Franklin D. Roosevelt will escape in the coming years the critical analysis evaluation and exposition that befell the policies and measures of Woodrow Wilson and the Entente Allies after World War I . ' . . . The Rockefeller Foundation, in 1946, allotted $139,000 to the support of the three volume history which was to be produced as described above."

Despite the heavy subsidization, the two court historians settled on two, rather than three, volumes but they failed the purpose of the Council on Foreign Relations to discourage "revisionism."

Langer has been a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations for more than thirty years and a frequent contributor to the CFR's quarterly journal, *Foreign Affairs,* over the same period. For more than thirty years, he has been affiliated with the Foreign Policy Association, a bulwark of leftist internationalism. He was on the Freedom House Bookshelf Committee, a group of leftists who selected books by leftists to enlighten "leaders and scholars in Africa, Asia and Latin America." He has been a trustee of the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist International Movement for Atlantic Union.

HAROLD D. LASSWELL was born on February 13, 1902 in Donnellson, Illinois, son of Anna Prather and Linden Lasswell. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago (Ph.B., 1922; Ph.D., 1926).

From 1923 until 1925, Lasswell pursued graduate studies at the University of Geneva, London University, the University of Paris, and the University of Berlin. From 1922 until 1938, he was on the political science faculty of the University of Chicago: assistant (1922-1924); instructor (1924-1927); assistant professor (1927-1932); and associate professor (1932-1938). In 1938 and 1939, he taught political science at the Washington (D.C.) School of Psychiatry. From 1939 until 1945, he was director of War Communications Research, a project of the Library of Congress.

Since 1946, Lasswell has been a professor of law at Yale University's School of Law, and from 1938 until 1945, the visiting Sterling lecturer there. From 1952 until 1961, he was a professor of law and political science at Yale University, and since 1961, has held the Edward J. Phelps chair in law and political science at Yale.

Lasswell has been a visiting professor at Syracuse University, Western Reserve University, the University of California, Yenching University, the University of Santiago in Chile, and the University of Patna in India. He lectured, from 1939 until 1946, at the ultra-radical New School for Social Research. In 1961 and 1962, he was a resident fellow of the Ford Foundation. He has also been granted fellowships by the Stanford Center for Advanced Study in Behavioral Sciences and the Social Science Research Council. He has been a consultant for the Department of the Interior (1934), the Department of Agriculture (1938-1939), the Department of Justice (1941-1942), the Department of State (1945-1947), and the Rand Corporation (1948-1967).

Lasswell is the author of *Propaganda Technique in the World War* (1927); *Psychopathology and Politics* (1930); *World Politics and Personal Insecurity* (1935); *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How* (1936); *Democracy through Public Opinion* (1941); *Politics Faces Economics* (1946); *The Analysis of Political Behaviour* (1948); *Power and Personality* (1948); *National Security and Individual Freedom* (1950); *World Revolution of Our Time* (1951); *The Future of Political Science* (1963); *World Revolutionary Elites: Studies in Coercive Ideological Movements* (1966); and co-author of *Language of Politics* (N. Leites *et al.* in 1949); *Power and Society* (A. Kaplan, 1950); *The Policy Sciences* (D. Lerner, 1951); *In Defense of Public Order* (R. Arens, 1961); *The Public Order of Space* (M.S. McDougal and I. Vlasic, 1963); *Power, Corruption and Rectitude* (A. Rogow, 1963); and *The Sharing of Power in a Psychiatric Hospital* (R. Rubenstein, 1966. During the past four decades, few, if any, American political scientists' works have been used as bibliographical references more often than Lasswell's.

In the 1930's, while at the University of Chicago, Lasswell was affiliated with the Chicago Repertory Group and the Chicago Workers Theater – both Communist Party "cultural" activities. He also lectured at the Communist (Workers) School.

Lasswell's other affiliations have included the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States); the American Civil Liberties Union (that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness); the Freedom House Bookshelf Committee (which was comprised of the most brazen leftists in the literary and academic worlds, including Gordon Allport, Cass Canfield, Bennett Cerf, Henry Steele Commager, Norman Cousins, Clifton Fadiman, Howard Mumford Jones, Max Lerner, Archibald MacLeish, Ashley Montagu, Elmer Rice, the Arthur Schlesingers, Junior and Senior, and Rex Stout); the League for Industrial Democracy (socialist); the National Council for Civic Responsibility (an election year drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists); and in 1961, he joined a host of radicals in a petition drive against the Internal Security Act of 1950.

PAUL L. LEHMANN was born on September 10, 1906 in Baltimore, son of Martha Menzel and Timothy Lehmann. He married Marion Lucks. He is an alumnus of Ohio State University (B.A., 1927; B.S., 1927) and Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1930; Th.D., 1936). He studied on fellowships at the University of Zurich (1932-1933) and the University of Bonn (1933). He was a Fulbright research fellow in 1955 at the University of Strasbourg in France. In 1937, he was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical and Reformed Church.

From 1933 until 1940, Lehmann was at Elmhurst College in Illinois as assistant professor of religion and philosophy (1933-1935); associate professor (1935-1938); and professor and chairman of the department (1938-1940). In 1940 and 1941, he was an associate professor of biblical and systematic theology at Eden Theological Seminary in Missouri. From 1941 until 1946, he was at Wellesley College as assistant professor of biblical literature, history, and interpretation (1941-1942) and associate professor (1942-1946). In 1946, he became a member of the Boston Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church. In 1946 and 1947, he was associate religious editor of the Westminster Press in Philadelphia. From 1947 until 1956, he was at Princeton Theological Seminary as associate professor of applied Christianity (1947-1949) and professor (1949-1956). From 1956 until 1963, he was at Harvard Divinity School as a professor of theology. Since 1963, he has been at Union Theological Seminary as a professor of systematic theology.

Lehmann has been affiliated with the Church Peace Mission (leftwing-pacifist); the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell ("Communist campaign"); the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); and the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist" – "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York"). He signed a petition asking President Eisenhower to extend clemency to Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act. He signed a clemency appeal on behalf of Communist Party leaders Gil Green and Henry Winston. He signed a petition to President Kennedy asking him to take executive action against the anti-Communist Internal Security Act and the Smith Act. He signed a statement urging the President and the Congress to uphold the constitutional rights of the Communist Party. He protested when the Attorney General of the United States listed Communist Party schools as subversive. He protested to the Attorney General of the United States on behalf of officials of the Communist and subversive Civil Rights Congress. He made several appeals on behalf of Morton Sobell, the convicted and imprisoned A-bomb spy.

ALFRED BAKER LEWIS was born on May 20, 1897 in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, son of Anne Rush and John Baker. His second wife is Eileen O'Connor Lane. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (A.B., 1916; LL.B., 1919).

From 1919 until 1924, Lewis was engaged in private law practice. From 1924 until 1940, he was secretary of the Socialist Party of Massachusetts; from

1930 until 1940, he was on the party's national executive committee. (Briefly, in 1925, he managed the Rand School of Social Science, a Socialist training school for labor agitators.) In 1943 and 1944, Lewis was vice president of Union Casualty and Life Insurance, and, in 1944, became president of the company. In 1954, he was president of District 50 of the United Mine Workers of America. In 1944, he was an unsuccessful candidate for the Connecticut legislature, on the Democratic ticket.

Lewis has gained his greatest fame as a prolific writer of letters-to-the-editor and for many years his Socialism-laden missives have been printed with great regularity in metropolitan newspapers throughout the country.

In 1941, Lewis was a founder of the Union for Democratic Action, whose guiding genius was Louis Fraina, one of America's first Communists. (The UDA had two primary concerns: the survival of the Soviet Union and the destruction of the Congress of the United States.) By 1947, the UDA had outlived its usefulness as a political force because it had been so overtly and brazenly pro-Communist. In 1947, a large segment of UDA's membership, including Baker, became founding members of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. In later years, Baker served on ADA's national board and contributed financially to ADA's support.

Baker's earlier affiliations included the League for Mutual Aid ("Communist enterprise"); the National Citizens Political Action Committee ("Communist front"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the National Sharecroppers Fund ("Communist front"); and the Greater Boston Peace Strike Committee ("Communist front").

For many years, Baker has been a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and he has served as a national officer of the NAACP. He has been a long-time member and a national officer of the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy. He has also been a long-time member of the ultra-leftist, globalist United World Federalists.

DAVID E. LILIENTHAL was born on July 8, 1899 in Morton, Illinois, son of Minna Rosenak and Leo Lilienthal. He married Helen Lamb. He is an alumnus of DePauw University (A.B., 1920) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1923). He is the author of *TVA: Democracy on the March* (1944 and 1953); *This I Do Believe* (1949); *Big Business: A New Era* (1953); *Change, Hope and the Bomb* (1963); *The Journals of David E. Lilienthal* (four volumes, 1964-1968); and *Management: A Humanist Art* (1967).

From 1923 until 1931, Lilienthal practiced law in Chicago. In 1931 and 1932, he was a member of the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. In 1933, he became the founding director of the totally socialistic Tennessee Valley Authority. After serving as director for ten years, he was chairman of the TVA from 1941 until 1946.

From 1946 until 1950, Lilienthal was chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. As head of the AEC, he sided with scientists such as J. Robert Oppenheimer and diplomats such as Dean Acheson to advance the position that the United States should share atomic knowledge with the Soviet Union, on grounds that scientists should not be secretive.

In 1950, Lilienthal left government service and began a successful search for personal wealth on Wall Street, where he associated himself with Lazard Frères & Company. He reorganized the Minerals Separation North American Corporation and made it financially attractive. Since 1955, he has been chairman and chief executive officer of Development and Resources Corporation, which he organized as a consultant firm with foreign nations as clients.

Lilienthal's *Journals* demonstrate clearly that during and after his years with the government, he was committed to an ideology well to the left of center. (His 1963 publication, *Change, Hope and the Bomb,* was favorably noticed by a lengthy review in the Communists' *New World Review,* November 1964.) He has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has made frequent contributions to *Foreign Affairs,* the CFR's quarterly journal. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, a short-lived campaign weapon for the Democrat Party, aimed principally at anti-Communists. He has been affiliated with the Southern Conference for Human Welfare ("Communist front") and the leftist-international American Association for the United Nations. He is a trustee of the Twentieth Century Fund, which has had a long history of making grants to leftists and their causes.

JOHN V. LINDSAY was born on November 24, 1921 in New York City, son of Eleanor Vliet and George Lindsay. He married Mary Harrison. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1944; LL.B., 1948). He was admitted to New York's bar in 1949. He is the author of *The City* (1970).

From 1950 until 1955, Lindsay practiced law in New York City. From 1955 until 1957, he was executive assistant to U.S. Attorney General Herbert Brownell. In 1958, under the political guidance of Brownell and with the strong support of the *New York Times* and *New York Herald-Tribune,* he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a Republican. He was re-elected in 1960, 1962, and 1964.

During Lindsay's four terms in the Congress, he established a national reputation as one of the most radical legislators ever to carry the Republican label. He became a hero to the Ripon Society, the over-publicized handful of so-called Republicans spawned by the Nelson Rockefeller-led Eastern Establishment. He voted with such great regularity for the program of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action that it would not have been unseemly for that group to have made him at least an honorary vice president.

Robert G. Smith, writing in *National Review* (October 6, 1964), summarized Lindsay's work as founder and leader of the Wednesday Club, a group of ultra-left Republicans in the House of Representatives: "It was in Congress that Lindsay-the-Liberal really hit his stride. From the outset of his service, he assumed the leadership of a small bloc of young Northeastern Republican Congressmen who specialize in providing the Democrats with the margin of victory in close votes. The principal spear-carriers in John Lindsay's private army of crypto-Democrats are: Charles Mathias Jr. of Maryland, Bradford Morse of Massachusetts, Abner Sibal of Connecticut, Stanley Tupper of Maine, Robert Stafford of Vermont and Ogden Reid of New York. From time to time they are joined by others: most notably Silvio Conte of Massachusetts and Fred Schwengel of Iowa, two older (and one would have thought wiser) men who evidently enjoy weaving themselves into doormats for Lindsay – conceivably on the theory that he will reward them with Cabinet appointments when the great day comes . . . and it is pre-eminently Lindsay and his troops who, as a bloc, do the deadly and essential work of the House Democratic leadership."

Mr. Smith also provided a glimpse of some of Lindsay's most flagrant departures from traditional Republicanism: "He co-sponsored with Congressman James Roosevelt a bill to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He was one of only two members of the House in either party to vote against the banning of Communist junk mail. In recent years he has voted *against* stronger references to the Monroe Doctrine in the Congressional resolution on Cuba, *against* extension of the Sedition Act to Americans abroad, *for* the abolition of loyalty procedures in defense industries and *against* banning morally offensive mail."

By the time Lindsay completed his congressional career, he had amassed a long roster of political heroes on the far left of the Republican Party. He designated them "moderates" – a label which belied their unmistakable far-left-of-center records as executives and legislators. They included William Avery, Alphonzo Bell, Clifford Case, John Chafee, Silvio Conte, John Sherman Cooper, Daniel Evans, Mark Hatfield, Frank Horton, Jacob Javits, Thomas Kuchel, William Mailliard, Charles Mathias, Bradford Morse, Thruston Morton, Charles Mosher, Ogden Reid, Howard Robison, Nelson Rockefeller, George Romney, William Scranton, Robert Stafford, and Charles Taft. Lindsay anathematized all truly moderate or conservative Republicans, especially Barry Goldwater, whose candidacy Lindsay refused to endorse during the 1964 presidential campaign. On the other hand, Lindsay was enamored of the Kennedy Dynasty on the far left of the Democratic Party.

In 1965, Lindsay was a successful candidate for New York City's mayoralty. His campaign manager was Jacob Javits, New York's senior U.S. Senator. Lindsay ran as a Fusion candidate, which simply meant that he was nominally a Republican but was endorsed by the Liberal Party, the bailiwick of Alex Rose, a veteran of ultra-left politics.

In 1969, Lindsay was re-elected as mayor, but a strange turn of events preceded his victory. In June, he lost in the Republican primary race to New York State Senator John Marchi, who was the choice of the Conservative Party as well as the Republican Party. Then, in the election campaign, Lindsay was given support by a group calling themselves Democrats for Lindsay, who, as might have been expected, represented the far-left wing of the Democratic Party. They included George W. Ball, Jonathan Bingham, Shirley Chisolm, Thomas Finletter, Roswell Gilpatric, Jack Newfield, Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., Dore Schary, Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Telford Taylor, Marietta Tree, and Stephen A. Wise. Many members of the campaign staff of the late Robert F. Kennedy worked for Lindsay. And from the far left of the Republican Party, he was given unstinting help by Jacob Javits and Charles Goodell. But even with all these forces behind him, his victory was rather hollow, as he received only forty-two percent of the vote.

As congressman and as mayor, Lindsay has been a demagog in the classic mold. In the Congress, he displayed a complete commitment to the welfare state. His method was simplistic: whatever welfarism Democrats promised, it behooved Lindsay and his Republican followers to promise more. As mayor, he has had a continuous history of demanding state and federal help for the solution of New York City's problems, which have been manifold.

During Lindsay's mayoralty, New York City – "Fun City," he has named it – has been plagued almost continually with strikes by city employees. Tax rates have soared. Businesses have fled. Terrorism has been rampant in the city's streets and parks. Welfare programs and sociological boondoggles have multiplied in numbers, size, and abuses. Lindsay took great pride in the ludicrous "instant welfare" system he instituted, whereby anyone who went through the meaningless ritual of signing an affidavit could receive welfare handouts immediately, circumventing any investigation of legitimate need.

Lindsay has sought and received the political support of ethnic voting blocs: Jews, Negroes, and Puerto Ricans. He has patronized hippies, criminals, black militants, white radicals, street and campus demonstrators and rioters, organized labor, peaceniks, and draft dodgers. He used his power as mayor to support the grape boycott led by Marxist Cesar Chavez. For the chairmanship of a civilian review board, he chose Algernon Black, a veteran of Communist fronts who could hardly have been expected to view police practices objectively. To the New York City Board of Education, he appointed Milton Galamison, whose long-time association with Communist projects was notorious. To the chairmanship of New York City's Commission on Human Rights, he appointed William H. Booth, a militant black powerite, who expressed his philosophy at the 1966 NAACP convention: "I don't preach violence. But if the people aren't getting what they need, they should go out and take it." Black, Galamison, and Booth have not been exceptional in the Lindsay Administration. A wide assortment of criminals, leftists, and racial agitators have found their way onto Fun City's payroll.

As a patronizer, Mayor Lindsay has had few peers. Dan Smoot wrote of a glaring instance: "On August 5, 1967, an airline, at the bequest of Mayor Lindsay, made a jet-prop plane and crew available to take 86 members of a New York City black muslim group on a one-hour sightseeing trip. This particular gang of Negroes is called the Five Percenters – because its members claim that the other 95% of American Negroes have 'sold out' to whites. Mayor Lindsay took the sightseeing trip with the Five Percenters. When their leader – Allah – came to the airport to see the flight off, Lindsay remarked: 'Allah is working with me. He's teaching me Muslim philosophy.' "

The Vietniks have been a special target of Lindsay's solicitous concern. He has supported and encouraged their anti-Vietnam War demonstrations, and no Republican in public office has been more critical of the Nixon Administration's policy in Vietnam.

The tone of Lindsay's own Vietnam policy was set at the time of the 1968 Republican National Convention. With great reluctance, he condescended to accept the Vietnam War plank in the Republican Party's platform even though it was not quite what he wanted. It advocated peaceful negotiations but evidently did not go far enough in the direction of appeasement. He elaborated on his views in *Look* magazine. He was disappointed that the Saigon regime was unwilling to negotiate with the National Liberation Front (the Viet Cong), and he was even more disappointed that the United States had not pressured its South Vietnamese allies into such a situation. He stated that United States policy should pursue simultaneous de-escalation by both American and North Vietnamese troops. Then, as if this were an accomplished fact, he continued: "As this process occurs, South Vietnamese of all political views will gradually resume responsibilities for political developments within their country. The most likely outcome is a rather ineffectual central government with many accommodations emerging piecemeal at the local and provincial levels. Certainly there would be people who call themselves Communists holding office in some villages and provincial governments, perhaps even in Saigon. [Why people would call themselves Communists unless they were Communists, he never explained.] Who holds office in South Vietnam is a decision to be reached by the South Vietnamese. Even a 'Communist' South Vietnam, if past history is any guide, would be as independent of [Red] China as Yugoslavia has been of the U.S.S.R."

Throughout the Nixon Administration's first year in office, Lindsay was unrelenting in his attacks on the Vietnam War policy as he faithfully followed the twists and turns of the peaceniks' complaints. He appeared very anxious to parrot the leftist line that the war was depriving the American people of welfare programs. Then, with the re-election campaign safely behind him, he joined in the anti-Cambodia hysteria generated in the spring of 1970. On April 29, 1970, the United Press International reported: "New York's Mayor John V. Lindsay said Wednesday night that it would be a 'mistake' for U.S. troops to go to Cambodia and the 'real heroes' are those young men who avoid military service and pay the price. His remarks came in a question and answer period following a speech to a group of students at the University of Pennsylvania. 'It would be a tragic mistake to enter Cambodia,' Lindsay replied to one question. 'It would expand what is now a Vietnam War into an Indo-China War.' He added, 'The people who have refused to go into the military service and who have accepted the legal consequences of it are the real heroes.' The mayor said the thousands of young men who have exiled themselves in Canada to avoid conscription are proof the people will not stand for the war."

When American troops were sent into Cambodia, Lindsay's anger was almost unbounded. Edward C. Burks in the *New York Times* (May 7, 1970) reported on a speech delivered by Lindsay to a National Magazine Awards dinner. According to Burks, Lindsay called for a new "not-so-silent majority" of dissenters to force the government to end the Vietnam War. He talked of a "dreadful miscalculation, even misrepresentation" in official policy. He called for a revitalization of the "anti-war legions," particularly among the young. He complained: "The country is virtually on the edge of a spiritual and perhaps even a physical breakdown." He said that the "tragedies" in Cambodia and at Kent State University, where four youths were killed in the midst of a campus riot, "make this a stark moment in our history." From the Awards dinner, Lindsay repaired to an anti-war rally at New York University Law School, where he made an impromptu speech that also centered on the Cambodian action. He lashed out at the Nixon Administration's "Orwellian logic of escalation and Vietnamization." He charged the Administration with causing a polarization and hostility so fundamental that "for the first time in a century, we are not sure there is a future for America . . . . Our hold on the future is very frail. That future – all that we are and all that we can be – dies a little bit each day the war goes on, and it dies whenever we succumb to the easy conclusion that the contestants there or here are gooks or devils, bums or pigs. We must not forget that we all bleed."

Lindsay did not confine his diatribes to the Vietnam or Cambodia policies of the Nixon Administration. He inveighed against domestic programs and the "Establishment." He directed a great share of his remarks at youths – black and white – but no matter how inflammatory his speeches, he was careful to emphasize that he sought nonviolent solutions and that he abhorred extremism. However, his precautions were only a minor part of his emotional rhetoric.

At the University of Pennsylvania, he told his young audience that there existed an acute crisis in the system of criminal justice, in which many people actually are denied justice, and that the system "tragically strikes more and more citizens as a criminal system of injustice." He mentioned no specific instances but continued his sweeping condemnation: "Black militants and white radicals, the poor and politically unorthodox in varying degrees and for different reasons have all lost faith in the system," and these groups view the law as "partisan or insensitive or vicious." He charged that bail appears more severe for blacks than for whites, but he cited no proof. Then he offered the gratuitous observation that abhorrence for the Black Panther philosophy (?) does not excuse treating any black more harshly than a white. Much of the blame for the alleged decline of faith in the judicial system he ascribed to "the intemperate language of the Vice President [Agnew]" and the "prosecution mindedness" of the Nixon Administration. (Lindsay made a seconding-speech for Spiro Agnew at the 1968 Republican National Convention. In 1970, Agnew described Lindsay as a "well-born elitist" who was more dangerous than campus "paranoids" because he espoused "philosophical violence.")

On April 2, 1970, at the Berkeley campus of the University of California, Lindsay told his audience of faculty and students that law-and-order legislative proposals by the Nixon Administration "constitute the most significant threat to freedom from our own Government in a generation." In language that would be more seemly in an ACLU or NAACP financial plea, he said: "We have seen all too clearly that there are men [unnamed, of course] – now in power in this country – who do not respect dissent, who cannot cope with turmoil, and who believe that the people of America are ready to support repression as long as it is done with a quiet voice and a business suit. And it is up to us to prove that they are wrong . . . . But you can stand as an alternative – as a check on how we work – as a warning system to men and to organizations which are not helping to make this country what it can be. You helped reveal the systematic denial of rights to black men. You helped us see why a war must be stopped in mid-course. You helped illustrate the link between the academic world and the world of cold war politics and special privilege. And you are helping now in the fight to save this earth from its own inhibitions." There was a touch of irony in the fact that Lindsay had chosen the Berkeley campus as his forum for showering praises on revolutionaries. For a decade the campus had been the scene of almost continual turmoil perpetrated by old and new left groups, pacifists, anarchists, draft dodgers, Vietniks, black militants, Communists (both Soviet-oriented and Red China-oriented), and propagandists for free and filthy speech.

At Berkeley, Lindsay made his usual slight obeisance to nonviolence: "Reliance on terror is one kind of dangerous response to a troubled time." He called violence and terror "cowardly and immoral." But he saved his heaviest allegations for the "System": "There is another kind of response – equally false, but even more dangerous. And that is the turn toward repression, toward repudiation of our rights and liberties – a turn supported by some in the highest levels of power . . . . Either out of ignorance, or out of calculated political cynicism, our citizens are being told that crime will stop if we erase the bill of rights, that unity will come if we suppress dissent, that racial conflict will end if we ignore racial justice and that protest will cease if we intimidate the people who report it."

Two months before he spoke at Berkeley, Lindsay used his talents for misrepresentation and hyperbole to moan about "repression" by many [unnamed, of course] in "positions of power." United Press International reported on a speech he delivered on February 17, 1970 to a Bar Association dinner in New York City. He centered his attack on the trial of the Chicago Seven – the self-styled Chicago Conspiracy: "All of us, I think, see the reason of the Chicago trial as a defeat for the integrity of the judicial process. All of us, I think, see in that trial a tawdry parody of our judicial system. When you try political activists under a conspiracy charge – long considered to be the most dubious kind of criminal charge – and when a trial becomes fundamentally an examination of political acts and beliefs – then guilt or innocence becomes almost irrelevant. The blunt, hard fact is that we in this nation appear to be headed for a new period of repression – more dangerous than at any time in years. The frenzy, the bitterness, the tumult of the last few years have led many people – including many in positions of power – to expect peace and order to come by whittling away at the constitution." It was all merely a paraphrase by Lindsay of the sentiments expressed by the leftists in the press and elsewhere, and even by the Conspirators themselves.

The more Lindsay moves to the left, the harder he attempts to portray himself as standing squarely in the middle, between what he has characterized as the nihilistic revolutionary left and the reactionary right. In a commencement address at Williams College on June 8, 1970, he issued a call for "a new center" in national politics, presumably his position. The "new center" would advocate an end to the Indochina war [no details, of course, as to how this would be achieved], would achieve an appropriate internationalism in foreign policy [no details, of course], and would work for progress and justice in America [as if both were lacking]. Then Lindsay, who a few months earlier had been a cheerleader for draft dodgers and deserters, proclaimed that "our plea for peace is not a plea for pacifism."

M. STANLEY LIVINGSTON was born on May 25, 1905 in Brodhead, Wisconsin, son of Sarah Ten Eyck and Milton Livingston. He was married to and divorced from Lois Robinson. His second wife was the late Margaret Hughes. He remarried Lois Robinson. He is an alumnus of Pomona College (A.B., 1926), Dartmouth College (A.M., 1928), and the University of California (Ph.D., 1931).

In 1928 and 1929, Livingston was a physics instructor at Dartmouth College. From 1931 until 1934, he was a physics instructor at the University of California. From 1934 until 1938, he was an assistant professor of physics at Cornell University. Since 1938, he has been on the faculty of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: associate professor from 1938 to 1954 and professor since 1954. From 1946 until 1948, he was chairman of the accelerator project at the Brookhaven National Laboratory where, with E.O. Lawrence of the University of California, he developed the cyclotron. In 1956 and 1957, he was director of the Cambridge Electron Accelerator at Harvard University. Since 1967, he has been associate director of the National Accelerator Laboratory in Batavia, Illinois.

In 1955, Livingston, as chairman of the Federation of American Scientists (a leftist-pacifist group), testified before a Senate Subcommittee to protest government security procedures. He adhered to the leftwing line that scientists should not have to undergo rigid security scrutiny before their employment on government projects. He argued: "The Security program is based on the assumption that the primary threat to our national security is loss of secrets, through espionage or accident . . . . The importance of scientific or technical secrets is almost insignificant compared with the value of trained minds and an environment in which imaginative thinking can flourish . . . .

" . . . The importance of imaginative thinking and development of new ideas is so tremendous that it stands out as the most essential need of our country; the question of keeping secret something which has already been done is of relatively minor importance compared with the necessity of increasing our lead by accomplishment and achievement with the special abilities our people have, our scientists have, to make fast progress . . . . "

What particularly galled Livingston at the time was the success the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy had had exposing Communists and Communist sympathizers who were in close contact with scientists working on programs that were deemed vital to national security.

A few years after Livingston testified on security procedures, he became an active national officer of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, one of the most prestigious leftwing pacifist groups in the country. (Many of Livingston's associates in SANE were veterans of the infamous Pugwash Conferences, during which American scientists hold highly secret meetings with officials of the Soviet Union – a circumstance that could reasonably be suspected of being a threat to America's national security.)

Livingston was also affiliated with Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.

GEORGE CABOT LODGE was born on July 7, 1927 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Emily Sears and Henry Cabot Lodge. He married Nancy Kunhardt. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1950). He is the author of *Spearheads of Democracy* (1962).

From 1950 until 1954, he was a political reporter for the *Boston Herald.* From 1954 until 1961, he was in the U.S. Department of Labor: assistant director of information (1954); director of information (1954-1958); and assistant secretary of labor for international affairs (1958-1961). Since 1962, he has been on the faculty of Harvard University's Business School: lecturer (1962-1968); associate professor, since 1968; and in 1965 and 1966, director of the division of international activities. From 1958 until 1961, he was the United States representative to the International Labor Organization's governing body, and in 1960 and 1961 was chairman of the governing body. In recent years, he has also worked as a labor-management arbitrator. (In 1962, he was Republican fodder in the senatorial campaign in Massachusetts against Edward M. Kennedy.)

During Lodge's years with the Department of Labor and the ILO, he became enamored of labor unions, especially those in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. One of the earliest indications of this attitude was displayed in an article Lodge wrote for *Foreign Affairs* in July 1959 ("Labor's Role in Newly Developing Countries"). He said that unions, particularly in Asia and Africa, had risen "on a wave of nationalism, becoming the spearhead of anti-colonial movements toward independence." As two examples, he cited the labor movements in Ghana and Guinea. Of Ghana, he wrote: "President [Kwame] Nkrumah and his Convention People's Party successfully secured the support of the labor movement in Ghana in 1954, both for domestic political reasons and to protect it from Communist influence." Of Guinea, he wrote: "Sékou Touré, who led the independence movement in Guinea . . . also got his start in politics as a labor leader. It was indeed as a labor leader that he first demonstrated his ability to command an almost religious devotion from his followers. It was his well-organized labor movement which gave him the power to force independence." It is tragic that Lodge could not comprehend what was common knowledge to students of African affairs: that Nkrumah and Touré, as dedicated Communist agents, were in power only because the international Communist apparatus willed them to be so. (In the same *Foreign Affairs* article, Lodge reached the heights of ignorance when he wrote of the Communist-saturated International Labor Organization: "They [the Communists] have made little headway in the ILO, and time and time again their totalitarian system has been shown up for what it is.") (In his *Spearheads of Democracy* and in public statements over the past decade, Lodge has expressed continuing admiration for Communist leaders [Touré, Nkrumah, Mboya, Betancourt] and Communist-dominated unions.)

Lodge is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Since 1963, he has been a member of the leftist-internationalist World Affairs Council of Boston; he was president of the organization in 1964 and 1965. He was affiliated with the leftist-internationalist American Association for the United Nations. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, one of the oldest and most influential benefactors of leftwing pacifism in the country. He has been a member of Franklin Littell's Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. He has been affiliated with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists.

A[MANDUS] WILLIAM LOOS was born on February 16, 1908 in Davenport, Iowa, son of Bertha Scheurman and William Loos. He married Dorothy Scott. He is an alumnus of Carleton College (A.B., 1930), Andover-Newton Theological School (B.D., 1933), and the University of Edinburgh (Ph.D., 1939). He also pursued graduate studies at the University of Tuebingen, Harvard University, and the University of Minnesota.

In 1933, Loos was ordained to the Congregationalist ministry and, for the next four years, held a pastorate in Waltham, Massachusetts. From 1939 until 1943, he was a professor of religion and philosophy at Spelman College in Georgia. From 1943 until 1946, he was with the Church Federation in Chicago where he was secretary of a department of ministry to servicemen.

Since 1946, Loos has been with the Council on Religion and International Affairs as: education secretary (1946-1956); executive director (1956-1963); and president (since 1963). The CRIA was formerly known as the Church Peace Union, which was founded by Andrew Carnegie to further his internationalist and pacifist aspirations. The stated purpose of the CRIA is "to relate religious ethics to international affairs," which, when translated into action, has meant all-out support for the United Nations, for disarmament, for appeasement with the Communist powers, and for a pacifist one-world. (In 1961, Loos went to the Soviet Union in company with a group of notable leftists who met with Soviet officials, including three members of the Central Committee of the Soviet Union's Communist Party. The meeting, arranged by the Council on Foreign Relations, discussed "disarmament and the guaranteeing of . . . international peace, the role of the United Nations in strengthening international security, the role of advanced nations in aiding under-developed countries, and the prospects for peaceful and improving Soviet-United States relations." The meeting was described as "unofficial" but it had the approval of the State Department.)

Along with his presidency of the Council on Religion and International Affairs, Loos has become an active and influential member of the Liberal Establishment. He has affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; the Foreign Policy Association, which has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism, and which has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists; the FPA's leftwing, pacifist World Affairs Center; Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party; and the Institute for American Democracy, hysterical successor to Arthur Larson's abortive NCCR.

JOHN WESLEY LORD was born on August 23, 1902 in Paterson, New

Jersey, son of Catherine Carmichael and John James Lord. He married Margaret Ratcliffe. He is an alumnus of Dickinson College (A.B., 1927; D.D., 1943) and Drew Theological Seminary (B.D., 1930). He pursued graduate studies at the University of Edinburgh (1930-1931) and Rutgers University (1931-1934).

From 1927 until 1930, Lord was an assistant pastor at the Emory Methodist Church in Jersey City. From 1931 until 1948, he held Methodist pastorates in New Jersey, at Union (1931-1934), Arlington (1935-1937), and Westfield (1938-1948). From 1948 until 1960, he was bishop of the Boston area of the Methodist Church; since 1960, he has been bishop of the Washington (D.C.) area. He has been an active official of the leftist-oriented National Council of Churches and the Massachusetts Council of Churches. In 1970, he became president of the council of bishops of the United Methodist Church.

Lord has been a long-time national advisory board member of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been a sponsor of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been a national council member of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He has been affiliated with the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"). He has been affiliated with the Churchman Associates, a leftwing group in support of pro-Soviet propaganda. He has been affiliated with the Church Peace Mission, which calls for peaceful "resistance" to Communism and for unilateral disarmament by the United States. He has been affiliated with the Massachusetts Civil Liberties Union, a branch of the national ACLU, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. He has sponsored the leftist-pacifist National Council to Repeal the Draft, which states the absolute falsity: "The draft has effectively abolished the freedom of American men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six." He is on the national committee of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a leftist-pacifist group which aids and comforts deserters and draft dodgers.

Lord has been a very active foe of congressional investigating committees and anti-Communist legislation. He petitioned frequently for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He petitioned for a probe of cooperative witnesses who appeared before congressional committees. He petitioned against enactment of the anti-Communist Mundt Bill.

In 1950, when the anti-Communist Nixon Bill was under consideration in the Congress, Lord – wittingly or unwittingly – carried the Communist line in his statement of protest as submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. To Lord, Communism was merely an ideology; the Communist Party was merely another political party; and anti-Communist measures were totalitarian. Said Lord at the time: "It needs to be remembered that the totalitarian has conquered when a democratic people abrogates its civil liberties and adopts totalitarian techniques to meet totalitarian threats.

"I am opposed to the Nixon bill because it does just this and, if passed, would abrogate America's long-cherished freedom. I sincerely believe, as a churchman seeking to perpetuate the spiritual principles upon which this Nation is founded, that legislation of this pattern is more in accord with police-state governments than it is with democratic governments, and ultimately will destroy the rights of a free people.

"There is an element of risk ever present in a democratic state. This risk, we must take if we are to maintain our faith in man and his essential dignity before God. To seek to remove this risk by destroying a political party is to jeopardize the rights of all political parties in our land. Our faith in present American institutions is such that we believe subversive elements can be contained and made ineffective, if we have the will to do so, by present existing legislation. I cannot believe that this proposed legislation could make our Government more secure than it is; for, ultimately, all security must reside in the free will and consent of those who are governed. To penalize those who may differ with us is to aggravate and not to remove the cause of discontent.

"Communism is an ideology that must be answered by a better ideology that demonstrates its ability to bring more of liberty, equality, and fraternity to mankind. A dynamic democracy in which the ethical ideals of religion are, within the conditions of freedom, translated into the realities of justice and brotherhood is impregnable to Communist infiltration, however virulent.

"The Nixon bill, by setting up a 'Subversive Activities Control Board' to prepare a list of 'Communist-political' and 'Communist-front' organizations, by granting the right to impose harsh penalties on members of such organizations, and by severely penalizing individuals who aid such proscribed organizations, does not strengthen but rather weakens democracy in America. Thus, I oppose it as un-American and contrary to the highest spiritual and political interests of our country. If this theory of government were accepted, it could lead to, and make secure, a totalitarian dictatorship in this country."

Lord was not original in his arguments, nor was he alone in his stand against the Nixon Bill. Similar arguments were advanced by representatives of the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, the American Labor Party, Americans for Democratic Action, the American Civil Liberties Union, and various Communist-front organizations. And, of course, almost all who did testify against the Nixon Bill had – as did Lord – more than a nodding acquaintance with Communist-front organizations.

One of Lord's main leftwing concerns has been the United Nations. As early as 1950, he petitioned for the seating of Red China in the UN. Eight years later, his name appeared in the Communists' *Worker* on a similar petition. As an apologist for the United Nations, Lord has utilized the standard clichés and twisted historicity employed by the bleeding-heart, leftwing internationalists during the past twenty-five years. To Lord, the UN is the "last hope for the creation of a greater humanity." In a widely circulated tract which first appeared in the October-December, 1963 issue of the *Wesley Quarterly,* he said: "If the United Nations dies, not Russia but the free world will be to blame. To destroy the UN would be Russia's greatest achievement. But today intelligent men, moved by fear rather than by faith, are engaged in crusades of suspicion and are seeking to undermine this world organization.

"Because of a narrow and dangerous patriotism they refuse to accept the great presuppositions in the UN Charter and the aims of the UN . . . .

"If the leaders of these crusades of suspicion succeed in killing the UN, this is what they will do: (1.) They will destroy daily contacts between two sides in the world, and these contacts are a force for peace. (2.) The transition from colonialism to self-rule will be bloody rather than peaceful and sane. (3.) They will blow up a dam that has already prevented local wars from spreading in Korea, Indonesia, Kashmir, and Palestine. (4.) They will convince millions now receiving medicine, milk, and plows from the UN that there is no hope for the hungry and the homeless except in communism. (5.) They will greatly increase the chance that man will one day wipe himself from the face of the earth . . . . "

ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN was born on January 16, 1929 in Newark, New Jersey. He is an alumnus of the University of North Carolina (B.A., 1949) and Yale University (LL.B., 1954). He married Jennifer Lyman.

In *The Making of a President – 1968,* Theodore White wrote: "We must see Lowenstein . . . in 1967 as a faintly preposterous character – a self-appointed, self-anointed voice of American youth, revolving from campus to campus, from California to New England, from the Bronx to Sherman, Texas, calling for revolt, while, at the same time, surfacing in Washington as a self-constituted one-man lobby pleading with whatever Congressmen or Senators he could buttonhole for an end to war and the repudiation of Lyndon Johnson. 'It was like looking for your father,' recalled Lowenstein some time later, 'but who was I? Nobody knew who I was. There was a credibility problem. I must have spoken to twenty Senators or Congressmen. Some thought I was a kook. Some of them listened. No one defended Lyndon Johnson or the war. I told them we had the strength, I told them there was a base in the student movement. But no major figure would take the lead – I couldn't find a trigger or a fuse.' "

Neither White's appraisal of Lowenstein nor Lowenstein's self-depreciatory quotation should be taken at face value. By 1967, Lowenstein was far from being "faintly preposterous" and he was certainly not an unknown in liberal political circles. For twenty years, he had worked strenuously to make himself known and he had succeeded.

As an undergraduate at the University of North Carolina, Lowenstein became extremely active in campus politics as a flaming liberal. In 1949, when the ultra-liberal Frank Graham was appointed by North Carolina's Governor to the United States Senate to fill a vacancy, Lowenstein went to work as a special assistant to Graham. In 1951, he was elected president of the ultra-leftist National Student Association. In the 1952 presidential campaign, he was chairman of Students for [Adlai] Stevenson; and in the same year, he was an aide to Eleanor Roosevelt at the United Nations. ("With [Norman] Thomas and Mrs. Roosevelt, Graham formed the trinity of Lowenstein's political heritage; they are all people he describes as 'sweet,' a word he often uses." – David Halberstam, "The Man Who Ran Against Lyndon Johnson," *Harper's* magazine, December 1968.)

After law school and two years of army service, Lowenstein resumed his place in liberal politics. In 1959, he was a foreign policy assistant to U.S. Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. In 1960, Lowenstein was an alternate delegate to the Democratic National Convention and, in that same year, he made a futile bid to get nominated in a Congressional race in New York City.

It was at this stage of his career that Lowenstein turned his attention to leftist politics on the international scene. He journeyed to South-West Africa where he allied himself with anti-government agitators. (The *New York Times* has described this trip as "clandestine" – which undoubtedly meant that Lowenstein was traveling under the auspices of the Central Intelligence Agency. At any rate, the "clandestine" trip became the subject of Lowenstein's book, *Brutal Mandate,* a highly biased and inaccurate diatribe against the Republic of South Africa. Eleanor Roosevelt wrote a foreword to *Brutal Mandate,* and somehow managed to misplace South-West Africa geographically.) Later, Lowenstein went to Spain to organize rebels against the Franco regime – another venture which smacked of CIA mischief.

In 1961 and 1962, Lowenstein was on the faculty of Stanford University, where he antagonized university authorities by supporting campus agitators. From Stanford he went to the faculty of North Carolina State University for two years, during which he antagonized state authorities by supporting local Negro agitators who were demonstrating for their "civil rights." Meanwhile, Lowenstein went to Mississippi where he helped to organize the leftist Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which all but convulsed the Democratic National Convention in 1964. (Lowenstein became a very important figure in the ranks of the Negro agitators. He became a board member of Martin L. King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference and he was a close friend and advisor of King's. When Lowenstein's name first appeared on a SCLC letterhead, he was listed as Reverend Allard Lowenstein – an understandable mistake by some staff member since most members of the board were Baptist ministers. Lowenstein, however, notified the staff that he was Jewish and one of King's aides changed the listing to read Rabbi Allard Lowenstein.)

Before 1964, Lowenstein had evidently not ingratiated himself with the Kennedy Dynasty. However, during New York's senatorial race of that year, he remedied that omission. "Lowenstein had supported [Robert] Kennedy for the Senate in 1964 and afterwards had become an informed adviser, a valuable connection to New York reform circles for Kennedy and a valuable reporter for him on what was happening among young people." – (David Halberstam in *Harper's* magazine, December 1968.)

Lowenstein's liberal credentials were enhanced when he joined Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy (to extend diplomatic recognition to Red China) and the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. By 1966, he was on the national board of the ultra-leftist Americans for Democratic Action. (In 1968, Lowenstein was a vice chairman of ADA, but although that organization endorsed the presidential candidacy of Hubert Humphrey, he refused to campaign for his old boss.)

On August 15, 1967, Lowenstein ("the aging but permanent youth leader," to quote Theodore White) addressed the National Student Association, which had been recently exposed as a satellite of the CIA. In his remarks to the NSA, Lowenstein formally launched his Dump Lyndon Johnson Movement. (Later, Lowenstein said that he and his young cohorts were greatly encouraged by John Kenneth Galbraith, who was about to become national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action and who was a key figure in the Kennedy Dynasty's political machinations.)

In the twelve months following his

anti-Johnson pronouncement to the NSA, Lowenstein gave every indication that he was a power-mad pied piper for campus lefties and a would-be kingmaker. But from the beginning, he encountered difficulties because the kings were reluctant.

Lowenstein's first choice for the Democratic presidential nomination was Robert Kennedy, who begged off at the time. Retired General James Gavin and Senator George McGovern (D.-S.D.) were then approached, but Lowenstein's offer was rebuffed by both men. Finally, Lowenstein turned to Minnesota's Senator Eugene McCarthy. (By December 1967, Lowenstein's importance on the national political scene was demonstrated when he received an invitation to appear on radio and television's nationwide "Meet the Press" program, where Lowenstein was asked to discuss the 1968 presidential campaign and to reveal his personal choice.)

Lowenstein proved to be an astute political manager for Eugene McCarthy, even though the two men were not completely compatible except in their opposition to the Vietnam War. McCarthy cooed that there should be neither a political nor a diplomatic victory in the war. Lowenstein insisted that the war was "morally, politically and economically indefensible."

It was Lowenstein's idea to create what became known as the "children's crusade" for McCarthy, for which campaign workers were recruited from high schools and college campuses across the nation. The tactics worked as McCarthy scored spectacular successes in state presidential primaries. High in Lowenstein's strategy was a proliferation of *New York Times* advertisements, dipped in vitriol and directed against Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam War policy. (Although Johnson gave no evidence that he ever wanted victory in Vietnam, Lowenstein would settle for nothing less than a total sell-out of the war effort by the United States.) Also, in 1967 and 1968, Lowenstein displayed a penchant for organizational titles: he founded the Coalition for Democratic Alternatives; the Coalition for an Open Convention in Chicago; with Curtis Gans from the ADA, the Concerned Democrats; and with Georgia's leftist agitator Julian Bond, the New Democratic Coalition.

When Lyndon Johnson announced that he was not a candidate for re-election and Robert Kennedy announced his candidacy, Lowenstein lost his enthusiasm for McCarthy's campaign, but he did remain in the McCarthy camp even though his political heart was lost to Robert Kennedy. However, Lowenstein decided to be a candidate himself. At first, he thought of the New York Senate race against incumbent Jacob Javits. Kennedy seemed to relish the idea: "It could be fun, we could really shake them up. You running for Congress is like the Pope running for parish priest." But somehow Lowenstein was dissuaded from his senatorial ambitions and settled on a campaign for a House seat. (Endorsed by Ralph Abernathy, Martin L. King's successor as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, "Pope" Lowenstein eventually won a House seat as candidate of the Democrat and Liberal Parties in New York's fifth Congressional district.)

With Lyndon Johnson out of the race, Lowenstein transferred his hostility to his old friend and employer Hubert Humphrey. McCarthy's "children's crusade," under Lowenstein's generalship, was to be an all-out war against Humphrey at the Chicago convention. It was Lowenstein's plan to bring hundreds of thousands of students to the site of the Democratic National Convention, but McCarthy vetoed this idea.

During the course of the convention, Lowenstein finally became totally disillusioned with McCarthy, who gave every appearance – in Lowenstein's eyes at least – of forfeiting the fight for the nomination. But Lowenstein had not exhausted his candidates. As a delegate to the convention, he flitted from caucus to caucus, from one smoke-filled room to another, trying to start a boom for Senator Edward (Teddy) Kennedy. He even made one frantic attempt to put Kennedy's name in nomination, but was strong-armed away from the podium by orders of the convention's bosses. But he was on his way to Congress.

As a freshman in the House of Representatives, Lowenstein has been a highly regular leftwinger. He spoke out against the House Committee on Un-American Activities, urging its abolition on grounds that he wished to protect freedoms under the First Amendment against HCUA's allegedly vague mandate. He leaped into the midst of the peacenik lobby, railing against the anti-ballistic missile program, chemical and biological warfare, and the Vietnam War. He has been virulent against Franco's Spanish regime, Greece's junta, the Republic of South Africa, the Brazilian junta, and other anti-Communist regimes. (At the same time, he has paid the routine liberal's lip-service to Captive Nations Week.)

On two occasions, Lowenstein travelled to Biafra and Nigeria – a favorite ploy of liberals. And in typical liberal fashion, he did not discover that the Nigerians were bent on genocide, nor has he mentioned that British and Soviet aid to Nigeria has brought the Biafrans near to annihilation.

On domestic matters, Lowenstein has sponsored the "democratic" processes: he wants the voting age lowered to eighteen, direct election of presidents, and federal handouts and giveaways for housing, education, and welfare, and the rest of the usual expensive catalog. As for tax reform, he suggests that confiscatory taxation be made more confiscatory.

Lowenstein, "the aging but permanent youth leader," has not lost his appeal on campuses. He is sympathetic to the demonstrations of the campus rabble, and more than any member of the Congress he has been totally involved in the Communist-run spectaculars: the Vietnam Moratoria.

ISADOR LUBIN was born on June 9, 1896 in Worcester, Massachusetts, son of Hinda Francke and Harris Lubin. He was married to and divorced from Alice Berliner. His second wife was the late Ann Shumaker. His third wife is Carol Riegelman. He is an alumnus of Clark College (A.B., 1916) and the Robert Brookings Graduate School (Ph.D., 1926). He also pursued graduate studies at the University of Missouri (1916-1917) and the University of Michigan (1919-1920). (At Clark and Missouri, Lubin was president of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, predecessor of the Socialist League for Industrial Democracy.)

In 1917 and 1918, Lubin was an economics instructor at the University of Missouri. In 1918, he was a statistician with the U.S. Food Administration. In 1918 and 1919, he worked for the U.S. War Industries Board. From 1920 until 1922, he was an assistant professor of economics at the University of Michigan. In 1924, he was an associate professor of economics at the University of Missouri.

Between 1922 and 1933, he was a member of the staff of the Brookings Institution, and from 1926 until 1932, he was on the teaching staff of the Robert Brookings Graduate School. In 1928 and 1929, he served as an economic advisor to the U.S. Senate Committee on Education and Labor, and in 1931, he was an economic advisor to the U.S. Senate Committee on Manufacturers.

From 1933 until 1946, Lubin was the U.S. commissioner for labor statistics. During the same period, he was chairman of the labor advisory board of the Federal Emergency Administration (1933-1939); vice chairman of the U.S. Central Statistics Board (1933-1938); an advisor to the federal coordinator of railroads (1933-1936); a member of the President's Economic Security Commission (1934-1935); the U.S. representative to the governing body of the leftist-saturated International Labor Organization (1935, 1936, 1937, 1941, and 1945); a member of the industrial resources commission of the National Resources Board (1937-1943); a member of the Temporary National Economic Commission (1938-1941); a deputy director of the labor division in the Office of Production Management (1940-1941); a special statistical assistant to President Roosevelt (1941-1945); and a U.S. representative – with the rank of Minister – to the Allied Reparations Commission in Moscow (1945).

From 1946 until 1950, Lubin was the United States representative to the economic and employment commission at the United Nations. From 1950 until 1953, he was the U.S. representative – with the rank of Minister – to the UN Economic and Social Council.

Alice Widener in her *Behind the U.N. Front,* published in 1955 by The Bookmailer, gave the following account as an indication of Lubin's leftist influence at the UN: "The tale is best told in a report issued by a special economic subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. According to indisputable testimony before this Subcommittee, it is a matter of historical record that during World War II a group of Marxists in the executive branch of our government and in positions of great influence in England worked hand-in-glove to establish 'a set of principles and rules of international commerce . . . so drafted that they would apply with equal force to all nations, regardless of their different economies.' Yet, as the Subcommittee report pointed out: 'It was never explained how the same rules of economics could be made to fit capitalist, Communist and Socialist nations.'

"As set forth by the Subcommittee, the chronology of this Marxist action to bring all commerce under control of an international cartel directed by the United Nations is as follows: November 1945 – The State Department presented in publication No. 2411 a set of principles and rules for international control of all commerce 'for consideration by the peoples of the world.' October 1946 – These proposals were the basis of discussion at the London Conference to draft a charter for an International Trade Organization. November 1947 – The United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment opened at Havana, Cuba, with more than 50 nations participating. Out of this conference was born the so-called Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization in which Chapter V dealt with 'restrictive business practices.' April 28, 1949 – President Truman submitted the Havana proposals to Congress. April 19, 1950 – Secretary of State Dean Acheson appeared before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to urge United States acceptance of the Havana Charter and participation in an International Trade Organization. May 12, 1950 – The Committee on Foreign Affairs refused to report favorably on President Truman's request. December 1950 – President Truman announced at a press conference that he would make no further request to the Congress for approval of U.S. participation in the rejected Havana proposals. December 1950 to December 1954 – In defiance of Congress and behind its back, second and third echelon planners in the executive branch of our government cooperated with the United Nations to implement every single one of the proposals contained in the Havana Charter.

"Thus the United States Delegation introduced Resolution 375 at the 13th session of the U.N. Economic and Social Council in 1951 calling for the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Restrictive Business Practices 'based on the principles set forth in Chapter V of the Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization.'

"This Resolution was adopted at the 549th meeting of ECOSOC, September 1951. A key figure involved in promoting the introduction of Resolution 375 in defiance of Congress was Dr. Isador Lubin, U.S. Delegate to the U.N. Economic and Social Council."

In 1949 and 1950, Lubin was a special assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State. From 1951 until 1953, he was a U.S. representative to the Korean Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In 1952, he was a U.S. alternate delegate to the UN General Assembly. From 1952 until 1955, he was a consultant to the Department of State. From 1955 until 1958, he was the industrial commissioner in New York State's Department of Labor. From 1959 until 1961, he was a professor of public affairs at Rutgers University.

Since 1958, he has been a consultant to the U.S. Bureau of the Budget. Since 1967, he has also been a consultant to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. And since 1962, he has been an economic consultant to the Twentieth Century Fund, which has a long history of financing leftists and leftist causes. Lubin has been a member of the Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union – two leftist-internationalist groups. Lubin has also been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

JOSEPH P. LYFORD was born on August 4, 1918 in Chicago, son of Ruth Pray and Philip Lyford. He married Margaretta Thomas. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1941). He is the author of *The Talk in Vandalia, Candidate, The Agreeable Autocracies,* and *The Airtight Cage.* (In 1967, he received the Sidney Hillman Foundation Award in Literature – a recognition highly prized in the leftist community.)

From 1938 until 1941, Lyford was a part-time reporter for the *Boston Post.* In 1946 and 1947, he was a reporter for International News Service. In 1947 and 1948, he was an assistant editor of the ultra-leftist *New Republic.* In 1949 and 1950, he was press secretary to Connecticut's Governor Chester Bowles – a leftwinger. In 1950, he was executive secretary to U.S. Senator William Benton of Connecticut – a leftwinger. In 1951, he was European correspondent for the *Hartford Times.* In 1952 and 1954, he was an unsuccessful candidate for Congress from Connecticut.

In 1953, Lyford became affiliated with the Ford Foundation's ultra-left-wing complex. From 1953 until 1955, he was staff director of the Public Education Association of New York City, for which he supervised a project ("The Status of Public Education of Negro and Puerto Rican Children"), which was financed by the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic. From 1955 until 1966, Lyford was on the executive staff of the Fund for the Republic, whose head was the eminent leftist Robert M. Hutchins. Since 1966, Lyford has been a consultant to Hutchins' Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, another offshoot of the Ford Foundation. In 1966, he became a regents professor of journalism at the Univeristy of California (Berkeley). There he made a study of two Negro communities in the San Francisco Bay Area.

For reasons which remain obscure, Lyford – since he became director of the Public Education Association in 1953 – has become deeply committed to leftwing sociological propaganda efforts on behalf of Negroes. His extreme bias was exemplified in the opening paragraph of his "Proposal for a Revolution" (*Saturday Review,* October 19 and 26, 1963): "In the course of his struggle, the Negro has presented Americans with a basic education about themselves. He has demonstrated that the majority of white Americans, in the South and out of it, are in varying degrees violently or silently opposed to the universal application of the Bill of Rights. By interposing his own body he has shown, beyond any reasonable doubt, the inability of the government of the people to guarantee the freedom of all the people or even protect the safety of their persons if they happen to be of an unusual [*sic*] color. The Negro has made it fairly clear that the Protestant churches in America have countenanced the subversion of fundamental Christian principles about as often as they have advanced the idea of human brotherhood."

The "Revolution" proposed in the title of Lyford's *Saturday Review* article was basically a massive socialist and statist program of federal spending on education ("a system of free tuition and scholarships for teachers, nurses, and social workers"), job-training programs through experimental high schools for dropouts, and guidance services. To build his case for federal paternalism over Negroes, Lyford relied upon the usual generalities and statistical gimmicks that Socialists employ to criticize the American economic and social system. To buttress his arguments he called upon sources that shared his leftwing ideological climate.

In 1969, Lyford became president of the Fund for Peace and head of the Fund's second National Convocation on the Challenge of Building the Peace, which was scheduled to be held in April 1970. (Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan American Airways, and former Under Secretary of State George W. Ball were co-chairmen of the National Convocation.) The Fund, whose history could be traced to 1957, had floundered in its efforts, and its first National Convocation, in 1969, was a fiasco. The combination of Halaby and Lyford instilled new life into the Fund. Halaby recruited support from the business community (American Airlines, Eastern Airlines, Bank of America, Boeing Company, Chrysler Corporation, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Corning Glass, Bendix International, Hiram Walker & Sons, Control Data Company, Riggs National Bank, and Bankers Trust Company), and Lyford brought in colleagues from the Fund for the Republic-Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions complex (Simeon A. Adebo, Harry Ashmore, Harrison Brown, Clark Kerr, Edward Lamb, Morris L. Levinson, Stewart R. Mott, Jubal Parten, Isidor I. Rabi, and Harold Willens).

In preparation for the National Convocation, Lyford journeyed to Moscow where he received the cooperation of Soviet leaders, who agreed to allow a delegation of Soviet officials to attend the April meeting. He was especially pleased when Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin sent him a message saying that he "supported fully the convocation and regarded it as an important step to improve Soviet-American relations." Kosygin's enthusiasm was understandable on many scores: the expenses for the Soviet delegates' journey to the United States were borne entirely by Americans; in attendance at the convocation were Pugwash veterans (Harrison Brown, Paul Doty, Bernard Feld, Franklin Long, Eugene Rabinowitz, and others) whose history had been one of slavish cooperation with their Soviet counterparts to achieve "peaceful coexistence," disarmament, and arms control on Soviet terms; soft-on-Communism and/or pro-Communism groups (Americans for Democratic Action, League for Industrial Democracy, Council for a Livable World, National Committee for an Effective Congress, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, New York Fellowship for Reconciliation, World Federalists, and Women's International League for Peace and Freedom) gave their endorsement to the convocation; an imposing roster of officials or former officials of the federal government's policy-making echelons (Zbigniew Brzezinski, Roger O. Egeberg, Adrian Fisher, William C. Foster, John Kenneth Galbraith, Richard Gardner, Arthur Goldberg, Ernest Gross, George Kistiakowsky, Foy Kohler, Robert Roosa, Cyrus Vance, and Jerome Wiesner) agreed to participate in the convocation; the State Department, according to Lyford, gave its full cooperation to the "nongovernmental" convocation, including the assignment of Under Secretary of State Elliot L. Richardson as the main speaker; and, most important, the team of Lyford and Halaby were providing a propaganda forum for the Soviet Union's delegation (who would masquerade as peace-seekers) and one-world American leftists, whose abject pleadings for Soviet-American cooperation in a variety of areas would serve as trial balloons for a State Department policy of accommodation and appeasement with the Communist world.

Lyford represented the support his peacenik spectacle received from the leftwing perennials and from the approximately forty corporations as "an unmistakable indication that a large percentage of the American people – including the business community – is impatient for an end to the cold war." Without offering a shred of tangible evidence, he said: "There is an obvious and growing public demand for some practical suggestions from the best minds in both the United States and the Soviet Union as to how all of us are going to survive in an age of nuclear weapons, pollution, and threatened starvation in the underdeveloped nations."

On April 28, 1970, Lyford and his colleagues wined and dined the Soviet delegation. On the following day, the National Convocation was held at the New York Hilton. American participants indulged in anti-United States criticism.

The well-publicized spectacle gave the peoples of the world an impression that the most influential individuals in the business, academic, and governmental communities of the United States were anxious that the history of Soviet perfidy be forgotten, that the U.S. and U.S.S.R. should be regarded as coequal goodwill partners in the pursuit of peace, and that the progression toward peace was so far advanced that even the most delicate questions could now be discussed in public: disarmament, arms control, cultural exchanges, and even mutual domestic concerns – violence, justice, and ecological problems. On the day following the convocation, the Soviet delegates and some of the principal American participants repaired to Princeton University, where they held a private parley. Lyford's National Convocation had evolved into another Pugwash Conference!

CONRAD J. LYNN was born on November 4, 1908 in Newport, Rhode Island. He is an alumnus of Syracuse University (A.B., 1930; LL.B., 1932). He has practiced law in New York City since 1934. In the mid-1930's he was a research assistant for the Works Progress Administration.

From 1928 until 1931, Lynn was a member of the Young Communist League. In 1934, he joined the Communist Party. He has testified under oath that in 1937 he was expelled from the Communist Party.

From 1937 until 1954, Lynn seemed to be content with obscurity. In 1954, however, he achieved some degree of notoriety as attorney for Anne and Carl Braden, both of whom have been identified under oath as Communists and have been associated with easily recognizable Communist fronts and projects.

Shortly after the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee (a Communist front) was formed in 1951, Lynn joined it and eventually became a member of its executive board.

In 1957, Lynn was a member of the American Forum for Socialist Education, which was composed exclusively of Communists and fellow travelers.

In 1960, Lynn visited Communist Cuba. He was accompanied by his wife and children. He later said of their experiences: "The Cubans are working out a new way of life. We want that way of life to succeed because it represents an advance over anything we have known. It is true that the United States is the wealthiest country on earth but it is not true that its vistas are as great as the vistas that have been opened for the Cuban people . . . . We have the power to seize the reins of our new future and to mold it more closely for the welfare of the people. This is the lesson of the Cuban revolution to us . . . . In Cuba, for the first time, we knew what it meant to walk down the street as a free man . . . by keeping the light of the Cuban revolution aloft, the destiny of all the masses will be advanced."

In 1962, Lynn again visited Communist Cuba. He explained this trip as being made in order that he could consult with four of his legal clients: Robert F. Williams, Mae Mallory, Harold Reape, and Richard Crowder. (The four were wanted as fugitives from justice and on kidnapping charges.)

In 1961 and 1962, Lynn gave pro-Communist Cuba speeches to meetings of the West Side (N.Y.) Committee for Friendly Relations with Cuba. In 1961, he was a guest of honor at a banquet celebrating the thirteenth anniversary of the Communists' *National Guardian.* In 1962, he was a speaker at a seventiethbirthday celebration for Pedro Albizu Campos, the imprisoned founder and president of Puerto Rico's Nationalist Party. (Members of the Nationalist Party made an assassination attempt upon President Harry S. Truman in 1950.) In 1963, Lynn was invited by the Castro regime to make an all-expenses-paid visit to Communist Cuba.

In 1966, Lynn lectured on "The Ghetto: Law and Social Change" at the Free School of New York, a Marxist training school.

In recent years, Lynn has been a writer for the *American Socialist* magazine; a supporter of the Peking-oriented Communist organization, the May Second Committee; a speaker for the militantly Communist and Peking-oriented Progressive Labor Party; and a supporter of the Student Committee for Travel to Cuba.

In 1967, Lynn became a member of the Revolutionary Contingent, "an openly Communist organization with headquarters in New York City, which calls for 'guerrilla action' in the United States and for volunteers to serve with Communist guerrillas in other nations." In 1968, he was a spokesman for an ad hoc black revolutionary movement that tried to get a presidential candidacy for his client, Robert Williams, who was then in exile in Communist China.

Lynn says of himself: "I definitely am on the left."

CURTIS D. MacDOUGALL was born on February 11, 1903 in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, son of Isabella McCollum and Gilbert MacDougall. He married Genevieve Rockwood. He is an alumnus of Ripon College (B.A., 1923), Northwestern University (M.S., 1926), and the University of Wisconsin (Ph.D., 1933).

At the age of fifteen, MacDougall began a career in journalism as a reporter for the *Fond du Lac Daily Commonwealth.* From 1918 until 1923, he was a reporter for the *Fond du Lac Commonwealth-Reporter.* From 1923 until 1925, he was a special writer for the *Two Rivers* (Wis.) *Chronicle.* In 1926 and 1927, he was a staff correspondent for the Chicago bureau of United Press. From 1927 until 1931, he was an assistant professor of journalism at Lehigh University. From 1931 until 1933, he lectured in journalism at the University of Wisconsin. In 1933 and 1934, he was a reporter for the *St. Louis Star-Times.* From 1934 until 1937, he was editor of the *Evanston* (Ill.) *Daily News-Index.* In 1937, he was editor of the *National Almanac and Year Book.* In 1937 and 1938, he was editor of "News Map of the Week." From 1939 until 1942, he was the supervisor of the Illinois Writers Project. In 1942, he was an editorial writer for the *Chicago Sun.*

Since 1942, MacDougall has been a professor of journalism at Northwestern University. From 1946 until 1956, he was chairman and commissioner of the Cook County Housing Authority.

In miscellaneous activities during recent years, MacDougall has been an editorial advisor to the Suburban Press Foundation of Chicago, and a consultant to the Fuller Newspapers, the *Chicago South End Reporter,* the Random House Dictionary, and the 1967 *Encyclopaedia Britannica Year Book.* He has also been a national advisor on academic freedom to the American Civil Liberties Union.

MacDougall is the author of *Brown and White Manual* (1930); *Reporting for Beginners* (1932); *Teachers Manual* (1932); *Interpretative Reporting* (1938; revised in 1948, 1957, and 1963); *Hoaxes* (1940; revised in 1957); *Newsroom Problems and Politics* (1941; revised in 1963); *Covering the Courts* (1946); *Understanding Public Opinion* (1952; revised in 1966); *Greater Dead Than Alive* (1963); *The Press and its Problems* (1964); and *Gideon's Army* (1965).

In 1948, MacDougall was a candidate for the United States Senate on the Progressive Party ticket in Illinois. His *Gideon's Army,* the first volume of a projected three-volume work, was a glorification of the 1948 national campaign waged by the Progressive Party and its presidential candidate, Henry Wallace. The book was acclaimed by such fellow travelers as Staughton Lynd, Frederick L. Schuman, and Thomas I. Emerson. The book was published by the firm of Marzani and Munsell, Inc., which has published the works of such Communists as Victor Perlo, Mike Newberry, and Herbert Aptheker. (Carl Marzani was convicted in a federal court on perjury charges when he denied his Communist Party affiliations. Alexander Munsell pleaded the Fifth Amendment when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee questioned him about his Communist activities.)

MacDougall has been affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); the Committee for Free Political Advocacy ("in defense of Communist Party leaders"), the World Peace Congress ("Communist front"), the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); the American Peace Crusade [1951] ("Communist front"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); and the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign").

In 1959, MacDougall joined in an appeal to President Dwight Eisenhower to extend clemency to Henry Winston and Gil Green, imprisoned Communist Party leaders. In 1961, he supported the ultra-leftist American Friends Service Committee in its call for a mediation of differences between Communist Cuba and the United States. On the Vietnam War, he has followed since at least 1963 the Communist line of protest against United States involvement.

STANLEY MARCUS was born on April 20, 1905 in Dallas, Texas, son of Minnie Lichenstein and Herbert Marcus. He married Mary Cantrell. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1925). He also studied at Amherst College and Harvard Business School.

Since 1926, Marcus has been associated with the Neiman-Marcus retail store in Dallas; since 1950, he has been president of the firm.

Aside from his eminently successful business career, Marcus has had a high degree of active involvement with left-of-center groups. He has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; the Foreign Policy Association, which has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism, and which has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists; the Fund for the Republic and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, two of Robert M. Hutchins' pro-Socialist congeries which evolved from the Ford Foundation; the Dallas Association for the United Nations and the Dallas Council for World Affairs, two leftwing-internationalist groups; Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party; the Institute for American Democracy, hysterical successor to Arthur Larson's abortive NCCR; the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy; and the American Council to Improve our Neighborhoods, which promotes socialistic urban renewal programs.

LENORE G. MARSHALL was born on September 7, 1899 in New York City, daughter of Leonie Kleinert and Henry Guinzburg. She married James Marshall. She is an alumna of Barnard College (A.B., 1919). She is the author of *Only the Fear* (1935); *Hall of Mirrors* (1937); *No Boundary* (1943); *Other Knowledge* (1957); *The Hill is Level* (1959); and *Latest Will* (1969). She is co-author of *War, Peace and Disarmament* (1966).

Mrs. Marshall has been a sponsor of the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"). She was affiliated with the League of Women Shoppers ("Communist-controlled front"). She has been a member of the leftwing-pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. She has been a member of the leftwing-pacifist Women Strike for Peace. She was a sponsor of the Norman Thomas Eightieth Birthday Anniversary Committee, a tribute to the patriarch of the Socialist Party. She petitioned to repeal the anti-Communist Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Communist Control Act. She petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to Red-liners Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, convicted for contempt of Congress. She has protested U.S. action against the Castro regime in Communist Cuba. She was a founder and remains a member of the national board of the leftwing-pacifist National Commitee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

CHARLES MATHIAS JR. was born on July 24, 1922 in Frederick, Maryland, son of Theresa Trail and Charles Mathias. He married Ann Bradford. He is an alumnus of Haverford College (B.A., 1944) and the University of Maryland (LL.B., 1949).

Since 1949, Mathias has practiced law with firms in Frederick and Baltimore. In 1953 and 1954, he was an assistant attorney general of Maryland. From 1954 until 1959, he was city attorney for Frederick. In 1959 and 1960, he was in Maryland's House of Delegates. From 1961 until 1969, he was a member of the U.S. House of Representatives. Since 1969, he has been in the U.S. Senate.

In 1968, when Mathias was a candidate for the Senate, he was one of the few Republicans ever endorsed and financed by the leftist-pacifist Council for a Livable World, which found that he "served four terms in the House and has affiliated himself by word and deed with the most humane and progressive elements in the Congress." The appraisal was accurate. In the Congress, Mathias has sided with the leftist Republicans and Democrats. He supported all the major features of the New Frontier-Great Society socialist legislation: federal subsidies for education, medicare, rat control, the "war on poverty," and civil rights. (He was especially anxious that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare be given virtual dictatorial power to enforce civil rights legislation in the South.)

With rare exceptions, Mathias has been a leftwing internationalist in foreign affairs. He has been a strong booster for arms control and disarmament measures, for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in its political manifestations, for trade with the Communist bloc, for joint scientific ventures with Communist nations, and for a reduction of U.S. armed forces in Europe. He is an avid supporter of the United Nations. He is proud of the UN's promotion of peace in Korea [!], the Congo [!], and the Middle East [!]. He views the UN as "the only global machinery for peace." He is hopeful that the UN will become a real "peacekeeping force." He has proposed that the U.S. Military Air Transport System be on permanent call for transporting troops and war matériel for UN purposes, and that there be a U.S. voluntary force of one thousand men on call for UN peacekeeping actions. He has joined other congressional leftwingers in proclaiming: "As a forum for negotiations, as a focal point for communication between nations, and as a vital inducement to economic and social progress the United Nations is both a symbol of optimism for the future and a very practical instrument of peace."

On the Vietnam War, Mathias has been with the doves since 1967 when he joined with seven of his Republican colleagues in the House in offering the Johnson Administration an elaborate plan to de-escalate the war. Over a period of three hundred days, the United States would take five successive steps to end bombing attacks against North Vietnam. At the conclusion of each step, North Vietnam would be expected to reciprocate with a de-escalation measure. Mathias and his colleagues insisted that the United States take the initiative in the de-escalation routine, but they never explained why. They did assume, however, that when the bombing attacks ceased, the United States and its allies would meet with the Communists at a peace table where the two sides could have mutual confidence in each other's word. At no time did Mathias and the other doves indicate any awareness of traditional Communist duplicity, nor did they seem to realize that North Vietnam was not alone on the Communist side of the war.

Mathias has worked closely with the ultra-leftist National Committee for an Effective Congress. He is a strong supporter of the ultra-liberal Ripon Society. And he has endorsed the mayoralty candidacy of New York City's John Lindsay, whose Republicanism is more fancied than factual.

PORTER McKEEVER was born on November 8, 1915 in Lenox, South Dakota, son of Maye McIlvenna and George McKeever. He married Susan Lobenstine. Between 1933 and 1937, he studied at Columbia University.

From 1937 until 1942, he was a newspaper and radio correspondent in Washington, D.C. From 1942 until 1944, he was in Reykjavik, Iceland, as a director for Elmer Davis' Red-lined Office of War Information. In 1944 and 1945, he was chief of American Psychological Warfare Operations in North Burma. In 1945 and 1946, he was a press relations officer for the Department of State, and in 1946 and 1947, was a press officer with the United States delegation to the United Nations. From 1947 until 1952, he was director of information for the United States Mission to the United Nations. In 1952 and 1953, he was executive director of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. (In 1949, he had been a resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States; in 1966, he resumed his membership.) From 1953 until 1956, he was employed by the ultra-leftist Ford Foundation. From 1956 until 1964, he was director of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations, in the important work of socializing the American economy.

Since 1964, McKeever has been the executive director of the United Nations Association of the United States, a major propaganda organization for the United Nations, for one-worldism, for disarmament, and for admission of Red China to UN membership.

McKeever has further entrenched himself in the Liberal Establishment as a trustee of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle, and as an advisor to the FPA's World Affairs Center, where corporation executives, educators, civic leaders, and journalists are brainwashed in briefings extolling the glories of pacifism, internationalism, anti-anti-Communism, anti-Americanism, and, most of all, the United Nations.

LIVINGSTON T. MERCHANT was born on November 23, 1903 in New York City, son of Mary Tallmadge and Huntington Merchant. He married Elizabeth Stiles. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1926).

From 1926 until 1942, Merchant was an investment counsellor and banker in Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey. From 1942 until 1962, he was with the Department of State: as assistant chief in the division of defense materials (1942); chief of the blockade and supply division (1943); chief of the war areas economic division (1944); counsellor for economic affairs, with the rank of minister, at the U.S. Embassy in Paris (1945-1946); chief of the aviation division and deputy director of the office of transportation and communications (1946-1948); counsellor at the U.S. Embassy in Nanking (1948-1949); deputy assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs (1949-1951); deputy for political affairs, with the rank of ambassador, to the United States special representative in Europe (1952-1953); assistant secretary of state for European affairs (1953-1956 and 1958-1959); under secretary of state for political affairs (1959-1961); and U.S. Ambassador to Canada (1956-1958 and 1961-1962).

Since 1965, Merchant has been the United States executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. He has continued, since his retirement from the diplomatic service, as a consultant to the Secretary of State and to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Merchant is an internationalist, especially interested in closer political and economic relations between the NATO nations. He is a director of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council of the United States. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is active in the leftist-internationalist Washington Center of Foreign Policy Research, associated with the School of Advanced International Studies of the Johns Hopkins University.

ROBERT B. MEYNER was born on July 3, 1908 in Easton, Pennsylvania, son of Mary Baumle and Gustave Meyner. He married Helen Stevenson. He is an alumnus of Lafayette College (A.B., 1930) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1933). In 1934, he began his private law practice in New Jersey.

From 1947 until 1954, Meyner was a Democrat in the New Jersey Senate and served as the minority leader from 1950 until 1954. From 1954 until 1962, he was Governor of New Jersey. He resumed his law practice in 1962. He has been a delegate to every Democratic National Convention since 1948.

Meyner has been a long-time member of the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been an official of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists.

J. IRWIN MILLER was born on May 26, 1909 in Columbus, Indiana, son of Nettie Sweeney and Hugh Miller. He married Xenia Simons. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1931) and Oxford University (M.A., 1933).

Since 1934, Miller has been with the Cummins Engine Company, serving successively as general manager, vice president, executive vice president, president, and since 1951, chairman of the board. Since 1944, he has been with the Union Starch and Refining Company, serving successively as executive vice president, president, and since 1953, chairman of the board. Since 1947, he has been with the Irwin-Union Bank and Trust Company, serving as president (1947-1954), and since 1954, as chairman of the board. He is a member of the boards of directors of American Telephone and Telegraph, Purity Stores, Equitable Life Assurance, and Chemical Bank New York Trust Company. He is a trustee of Butler University, Yale University, the Christian Theological Seminary of Indianapolis, the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation, and the socialist-oriented Committee for Economic Development.

Since at least 1952, Miller has been a generous financial contributor to the Republican Party. He was a very active fund raiser for Dwight Eisenhower. He has contributed heavily to the campaigns of his good friend John Lindsay. In 1968, he headed a Nelson Rockefeller-for-President Committee.

Miller's Republicanism has not been marked by consistency. He supported, and reportedly voted for, Lyndon B. Johnson vis-à-vis Barry Goldwater. In turn, President Johnson gave Miller a great deal of national publicity by appointing him to various commissions: a commission to study health, manpower, and services; a commission to study the

U.S. Post Office Department (the commission eventually recommended that postal services be taken over by a government corporation – a statist wolf in sheep's clothing); and a commission to study ways in which big business could, in partnership with government, rebuild slums. The most important commission on which Miller served as chairman strongly recommended a cause dear to Lyndon Johnson's heart – the expansion of trade with the Communist bloc in order "to build bridges to the East."

In 1961, Miller, as the first layman ever elected to the position, began a three-year term as president of the National Council of Churches. On the American scene, Miller led the NCC into a strong supporting role for civil rights agitation and, for his own part, helped to organize Martin L. King's 1963 March on Washington.

In 1962, Miller led a group of American church leaders on a three-week trip to the Soviet Union. Upon Miller's return to his hometown of Columbus, Indiana, he delivered a lengthy public speech on his experiences. The speech was a curious collection of sensible observations and some incredible inanities. He also proved to be either highly gullible or willingly receptive to Soviet propaganda.

On the positive side, Miller remarked: " . . . There can be no doubt any longer, if indeed there ever was, concerning the danger and aggressive threat which the Soviet Union and Red China pose, both to the committed western nations and to the uncommitted nations." And he spoke of " . . . the cruelty and aggression of the Soviet Government." On the other hand, after his strictly guided three-week stay in the Soviet Union, he talked about fifty million Christians in the Soviet Union, apparently free to attend crowded church services, even though, as he admitted, "the Communist Party is dedicated to the elimination of religion." Through some tortuous reasoning process, he managed to provide a clear distinction between the Communist Party and the Soviet government, ignoring the fact that no individual could rise to power in the government unless he were a Communist. Yet, somehow, he could ascribe a high moral tone to the Communist Party and the Soviet government: "In many ways you find that Russia possesses a most old-fashioned government, conservative, almost to the point of being Victorian. Many of their individual and corporate standards of morality are taken whole, directly from Christianity, with only the Christian terminology dropped." – "Take the word Modesty, as an example. There are no night clubs in Moscow; salacious films cannot be shown, offenses against public morals are punished more severely there than here." – "The Communist Party, to our surprise, is dedicated to the elimination of both drinking and smoking." – "The 22nd Party Congress [1961] . . . on the subject of Soviet morals . . . said: 'The moral code of the builders of Communism should comprise the following principles: Love of the Mother Land, conscientious labor for the good of society, a high sense of public duty, humane relations and mutual respect between individuals, honesty, truthfulness, moral purity, modesty and unpretentiousness in social and private life; mutual respect in the family and concern for the upbringing of children; fraternal solidarity with the working people of all countries and with all peoples.' How difficult it is to take exception to these words and how quick you and I are to attach both cynical and sinister interpretations to them. And yet, in many respects there is general and sincere acceptance of these principles by the citizens of the Soviet Union."

As has been true of so many Americans who have visited the Soviet Union, Miller was favorably and deeply impressed by the Russian people. But he was not content to confine his conclusions to the people he had met. He soared into the realm of generalities, making judgments of untold millions of Russian people: " . . . The beginning of an understanding of the people of Russia lies in a realization that they have been out of touch with the West for 1,000 years. They are Europeans just as we are Europeans, but they have been out of touch with our life, since the fall of the Eastern Empire . . . [when] East and West lost their contacts not only in religion but in every sphere, political, trade and cultural, and no one is going to bridge the gap of 1,000 years overnight!" Unfortunately, Miller did not buttress his unique historical thesis with any sort of proof.

Again, in the area of generalization, Miller encompassed all the Russian people in a judgment: "With regard to love of country, I never encountered a deeper sense of patriotism anywhere than in the Soviet Union. Their love of country is not a love for the Communist government any more than our patriotism is an uncritical love for the Truman, Eisenhower or Kennedy government. Theirs is a love for Mother Russia under any government which is ennobling to the people and the qualities of honesty, truthfulness, and unpretentiousness are generally characteristic and true of the individuals as you meet them." Nowhere in his lengthy speech did Miller ever indicate how many Russian people he interviewed before making such a sweeping conclusion.

Miller has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation. He is a long-time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

LOREN MILLER was born on January 20, 1903 in Pender, Nebraska, son of Nora Herbaugh and John Miller. He married Juanita Ellsworth. Between 1920 and 1926, he studied at the University of Kansas, Washburn College, and Howard University. He is an alumnus of Washburn Law School (LL.B., 1928). He is the author of *The Petitioners* (1967).

In 1928 and 1929, Miller practiced law in Kansas, and from 1933 until 1964, in California. Between 1929 and 1933, he was a reporter for the *California Eagle,* a Negro weekly in Los Angeles; and from 1954 until 1964, he was its publisher and author of a column in the paper.

Miller has been affiliated with the Book Union ("distributors of Communist literature"); the Harry Bridges Defense Committee ("Communist front"); the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("subversive and un-American"); Mobilization for Democracy (one of the "key Communist fronts in California" – "engaged in inciting riots, racial hatred, and disrespect for law and order"); the National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners ("subversive and Communist" – "Communist front"); the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); the American League against War and Fascism ("subversive and Communist"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Progressive Citizens of America in Los

Angeles ("Communist front"); and the Western Writers' Congress ("Communist front"). He signed a Communist Party election petition in 1932. His name has appeared quite often in Communist Party publications: he wrote "Why I Will Vote 'Red,'" for the *Daily Worker,* July 11, 1932; he wrote an article for the *Daily Worker,* September 24, 1932, in which he pleaded "to Negroes everywhere in the United States to vote Communist"; his name appeared in the *People's World,* May 12, 1948, as a signer of a statement opposing the Mundt anti-Communist bill; in *People's World,* July 22, 1948, he was quoted as attacking the arrest of Communist Party leaders; in the *Daily Worker,* December 24, 1931 and December 21, 1935, he was named as a reporter for that journal; in the *Daily Worker,* May 4, 1938, he was named as a contributor to that journal; the Communist Party's *New Masses* named him as an editor (August 20, 1935), associate editor (January 14, 1936), and contributing editor (June 2, 1936; January 5, 1937; May 11, 1937; September 7, 1937; January 11, 1938; and September 20, 1938); in *Soviet Russia Today,* March 1937, his name appeared as signer of an open letter to American liberals, defending Stalin's infamous purge trials; in *People's World* September 28, 1950, he was named as one of a group of Los Angeles lawyers who signed a brief against an ordinance requiring registration of Communists; and in the *People's World,* May 17, 1950, he signed a statement against loyalty oaths.

Since 1964, Miller has been a municipal court judge in Los Angeles. He was appointed to the bench by California's Governor Edmund G. (Pat) Brown. In a highly flattering article in the *Los Angeles Times,* staff writer Paul Weeks described Miller as having been a "Democrat since he voted for Al Smith in 1928." Weeks wrote that "Miller has espoused often unpopular causes (he defended Black Muslims after a violent clash with Los Angeles police) in law and politics." Somehow Weeks managed to write his lengthy article (about 25 column-inches) without a hint that Miller has ever been affiliated with the Communist Party, its publications, or its fronts.

Miller has been a national officer of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead of Negro agitation for more than half a century.

URI MILLER was born on July 19, 1906 in New York City, son of Esther Ingber and Samuel Miller. He married Rose Shafer. He is an alumnus of Lewis Institute (B.S., 1926) and Hebrew Theological College (D. of Rabbinic Law, 1927).

From 1927 until 1945, Miller served congregations in Terre Haute, Indiana; Omaha; and New Orleans. Since 1945, he has been with the Beth Jacob Congregation in Baltimore. He has been president of the Rabbinical Council of America and the Synagogue Council of America. He is the author of many books in the religious field.

Miller has been affiliated with the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the Committee to End Sedition Laws (under "complete domination by the Communist Party"); the Los Angeles Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case (an auxiliary of the National Committee, a "Communist front"); the Maryland Committee for Peace ("Communist peace organization"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – a "Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); and the National Committee to Secure Justice for Morton Sobell ("Communist campaign"). He signed a friend-of-the-court brief on behalf of the Communist Party. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.

WALTER F. MONDALE was born on January 5, 1928 in Ceylon, Minnesota, son of Claribel Hope and Theodore Mondale. He married Joan Adams. From 1946 until 1949, he attended Macalester College. During his years at Macalester, he became a political activist. He organized and recruited students for the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party. In 1948, he campaigned for Hubert Humphrey, who was making a successful bid for the United States Senate. (Mondale became a protégé of Humphrey; but along the way, his political idols have included Henry A. Wallace, Eugene McCarthy, Orville Freeman, William O. Douglas, and Joseph L. Rauh Jr. However, in 1968, Mondale's loyalty to Humphrey showed its durability when he served as co-chairman with Oklahoma's Senator Fred Harris of Humphrey's campaign for the presidency.)

In 1949 and 1950, Mondale interrupted his collegiate career to become executive secretary of Students for Democratic Action, the now-defunct youth branch of Americans for Democratic Action.

After his stint with the SDA in Washington, D.C., Mondale returned to college and received a degree from the University of Minnesota (B.A., 1951). From 1951 until 1953, he was in the army and saw service in Korea. After his discharge from the army, he attended and graduated from the University of Minnesota's law school (LL.B., 1956).

In 1956, Mondale was admitted to the Minnesota bar and joined a law firm where one of the partners was Governor (later Secretary of Agriculture) Orville Freeman. In 1958, Mondale was campaign manager for Freeman, who was re-elected for a third term.

From 1958 until 1960, Mondale was a special assistant to Minnesota's Attorney General. In May 1960, Governor Freeman appointed Mondale to serve the remaining eight months of the unexpired term of the Attorney General, who had resigned. In 1960, Mondale was elected Attorney General; he was re-elected in 1962.

In 1964, Mondale was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention. At the convention, he helped in the drafting of the civil rights plank of the party's platform. As a member of the convention's credentials committee, he was instrumental in settling a tumultuous debate over the Mississippi delegation. Mondale worked out a compromise by allowing two Negro delegates from Mississippi's Freedom Democratic Party to take seats in the convention alongside the regular Democratic Party delegation from that state.

When Hubert Humphrey was elected vice president of the United States in 1964, he hand-picked Mondale to serve his unexpired term in the United States Senate. (When Governor Karl Rolvaag appointed Mondale to the Senate, Humphrey described the choice as "excellent" and called Mondale "one of the most gifted men in politics today." For his part, Mondale described himself as a "liberal" who was "humbled by the prospect of succeeding Senator Humphrey.")

On January 4, 1965, Mondale took his seat in the U.S. Senate. In November 1966, he was elected to a full six-year term. (He was endorsed by the AFL-CIO.) In 1968, he boasted: "I really say I have the most liberal record in the Senate." It was not an idle boast. If there has ever been a political niche in the Democratic Party leftward of Hubert Humphrey, Mondale qualifies for its occupancy.

From the very beginning of his senatorial career, Mondale has given every promise of becoming the Senate's all-time big spender. It matters not whether the topic of a bill is agriculture, education, housing, welfare, or medicine, federal handouts are never too extravagant for him. In the Johnson and Nixon Administrations, every socialist proposal received Mondale's enthusiastic support.

There can be little doubt that Mondale considers that the federal government exists chiefly for paternalistic reasons: to provide jobs, houses, medical care, food for the nation's and world's hungry, education, auto safety, gun controls, agricultural subsidies, advice on family planning, and – in general – cradle-to-grave security. During his second year in the Senate, he introduced almost one hundred bills, most of which enlarged upon or initiated responsibilities for the federal government.

Johnson's "war on poverty," the Teachers Corps, the Peace Corps, Headstart, the Job Corps, the Alliance for Progress, the food stamp program, and the Agency for International Development have all received Mondale's fulsome praise and support. But it is probably in the area of "civil rights" that Mondale best displays his talent as a bleeding heart. His vocabulary would do justice to Ralph Abernathy as he talks about the ghettos, segregation, the seeds of poverty and discrimination, and white racism as the source of civil disorders.

Mondale's ghetto-mindedness was dramatically displayed when he spoke on behalf of the totalitarian Fair Housing Act of 1967: "It seems to me the American people are faced with two fundamental choices. They can either choose to suppress the violence and ghettos with whatever force may be necessary, and convert those ghettos into concentration camps – or they can choose to insist upon law and order and also take immediate action to isolate the underlying causes for rioting and obliterate them. The former will lead to practical State apartheid, and turn the United States into a course of repression and enslavement which will always plague us. The latter will at least keep faith with the ideas and dreams of this Nation." (Mondale's reference to "apartheid" was not haphazard. In 1967, when he urged the United States to support the United Nations "international day for elimination of racial discrimination," it was evident from his remarks that Mondale was simply anxious to make a singular and gratuitous attack upon the leftwing racial agitators' bête noire, the Republic of South Africa.)

In an era when the Congress and the Democratic Party are replete with liberals, Mondale has displayed an extremism that is virtually matchless. For example, in 1967 and again in 1969, he became the leader of a group of Democrats introducing a bill ("The Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act") "to give us a clear picture of how well we are doing in our efforts to provide a decent life and full opportunity for all Americans." Among the provisions of the proposed act was a plan to establish a Council of Social Advisers who would tell the President what new social policies should be established. Furthermore, the President would be required to furnish an annual report to the Congress "on the state of the Nation's social health." The essence of the entire scheme was to place the President in the role of Big Brother working hand-in-hand with a group of socialist prompters to insure that no old socialist program would suffer from neglect and that any new program the planners devised would get the prompt and effective attention of the Congress. (It is only natural for Mondale to view the federal government as the Great Social Benefactor. He recognizes virtually no end to the federal domain. On one occasion, he said: "The Supreme Court has given to Congress almost unlimited power to legislate in areas affecting interstate commerce." By his reasoning, Mondale sees all areas as affecting interstate commerce. But in his abysmal ignorance of the Constitution of the United States, he does not realize that all legislative powers – and they are *limited* – belonging to Congress are ordained by the Constitution, and that the Supreme Court has no power to bestow upon it any additional powers.)

In the various fields of foreign affairs, Mondale's leftwing credentials are complete. He is a disarmament buff. He supported the Nonproliferation Treaty and opposed the ABM system. He wants a permanent United Nations "peacekeeping" force. To him, the United Nations is "the world's hope for peace through law." His pro-Israeli policy sounds as if he were cued by Jacob Javits.

On the Vietnam War, Mondale has been an unimaginative dove. He has echoed whatever line has been currently popular, as enunciated by Lyndon Johnson, Hubert Humphrey, Edward Kennedy, Mike Mansfield, or such pillars of the leftwing press as the *New York Times* or *Minneapolis Tribune.* He has opted for a United Nations cease-fire, the "no-win" policy of the Johnson Administration, negotiations with the Vietcong. In the fashion of Kennedy and Mansfield, he has warred against the Saigon government. And, of course, he has been dissatisfied with the slowness of the United States "Vietnamization" program.

One of Mondale's strongest forays into foreign policy has centered on the matter of East-West trade. In the entire Congress, the Soviet Union and its bloc of satellites have had no more effective pitchman than Mondale. He insists that United States trade with the Soviet Union is not of strategic value to the Russians. On the other hand, he argues that United States trade with the Communists' satellite nations will attract the subjected Communists away from the Soviet Union and toward friendship with the free world. If other non-Communist nations trade with the Communists, the United States should do the same, according to Mondale. Otherwise, he complains, the United States will suffer a loss of business.

Mondale has not overlooked an appeal to youth. He favors an extension of the franchise to eighteen-year-olds. Of riotous youth, he explains: "The kids have a worse reputation than they deserve. The fact is there are only a few bomb throwers." However, he does believe that the federal government should take an active interest in the problem of student power. He has proposed the creation of a federal Commission on Student Unrest. It would have fifteen members appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"I hope," said Mondale when he offered his proposal, "that a commission will include the following in its study: Student grievances against universities; meaningful response by universities to criticism; the effect of injustices in our society including racial and economic problems, the war in Vietnam, the power of the military and the draft; the inability of our society to respond to its problems such as pollution and traffic; the quality of life in a technological age and the romantic reaction to it by young people and the loss of individualism resulting from the size of our institutions." (All of which should keep the fifteen-member commission busy for some years to come.)

MALCOLM MOOS was born on April 19, 1916 in St. Paul, Minnesota, son of Katherine Grant and Charles Moos. He married Margaret Gager. He is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota (A.B., 1937; M.A., 1938) and the University of California (Ph.D., 1942). He is the author of *Politics, Presidents and Coattails* (1952); *The Republicans: A History of the Party* (1956); and *Dwight D. Eisenhower* (1964). He is the co-author of *A Grammar of American Politics* (1949); *State and Local Government* (1952); *Presidential Nominating Politics in 1952* (1954); *Power Through Purpose: The Bases of American Foreign Policy* (1954); *The Campus and the State* (1959); and *Hats in the Ring.*

In 1938, Moos was a teaching fellow at the University of Minnesota. In 1938 and 1939, he was a research assistant for the League of Minnesota Municipalities. From 1939 until 1941, he was a teaching fellow at the University of California. In 1941 and 1942, he was a research assistant at the University of Alabama. In 1942, he was an assistant professor of political science at the University of Wyoming. From 1942 until 1963, he was at the Johns Hopkins University: as assistant professor of political science (1942-1946); associate professor (1946-1952); and professor (1952-1961 and 1963). He was a visiting professor at the University of Michigan (1955) and Columbia University (1963-1964). From 1945 until 1948, he was an associate editor of the *Baltimore Sun.*

During the Eisenhower Administration, Moos became one of the most prominent of the so-called modern Republicans. In 1952, he was an alternate delegate from Maryland to the Republican National Convention. From 1954 until 1958, he was chairman of Maryland's Republican Central Committee. In 1956, he was a delegate to the Republican National Convention. From 1957 until 1961, on the White House staff, he served President Dwight Eisenhower as a consultant, speech writer, administrative assistant, and special assistant.

When the Eisenhower Administration ended, Moos was well cared for by the ultra-Liberal Establishment. From 1961 until 1963, he was an adviser on public affairs to the Rockefeller Brothers. From 1964 until 1966, he was director of policy and planning for the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation.

Since 1967, Moos has been president of the University of Minnesota. His first crisis on the campus occurred in January

1969, when students seized university buildings. The seizure ended when Moos capitulated to the rebels. He blamed campus riots on "the changing racial texture of society" and "the fact that suddenly half the population is twenty-six." He sympathized with youths because they had been left "functionless in terms of engagement with society and the university. The distrust of old international methods has unleashed forces among our youth never before seen on the American campus. Searching for new answers in a society they despair of as dishonest, many students have embraced methods including both symbolic and mob violence." Moos suggested that students should become fully participant members in university government, while university administrations should become more flexible in meeting student demands for change.

BRADFORD MORSE was born on August 7, 1921 in Lowell, Massachusetts, son of Inez Turnbull and Frank Morse. He married Vera Cassilly. He is an alumnus of Boston University (B.S., 1948; LL.B., 1949).

In 1949, Morse served as a law clerk to the Chief Justice of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. From 1949 until 1953, he was engaged in private law practice, and during the same period was a lecturer and instructor at Boston University's law school. In 1952 and 1953, he was a city councillor in Lowell.

In 1953 and 1954, Morse was an attorney for the U.S. Senate Committee on the Armed Services. From 1955 until 1958, he was executive secretary to U.S. Senator Leverett Saltonstall (R.-Mass.). From 1958 until 1960, he was deputy administrator of the Veterans Administration.

In 1960, Morse – a Republican – was elected to the Congress of the United States, representing the fifth district of Massachusetts, and he has served continuously since 1961.

During his freshman term in Congress, Morse adopted the role of a modern Republican as he made some perfunctory criticisms of some of the more outrageous features of the New Frontier's socialist program. With the advent of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society, he revealed that his true ideological niche was in the midst of the House's ultra-liberals of both parties – virtual captives of organized labor, civil rights militants, and Americans for Democratic Action. Eventually, Morse became leader of the Wednesday Club, a bloc of ultra-liberal House Republicans who work closely with the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a very powerful leftist pressure group. Morse also belongs to "Members of Congress for World Peace through Law," which is composed exclusively of left-wing internationalists from the Senate and House.

In his approach to foreign policy, Morse has diligently touched all the liberal bases. He is a devotee of the United Nations, having described it from time to time as "an important multilateral peacekeeping agency" – "an important educational tool" – capable of creating "a climate in which freedom can grow." In 1965, Morse joined seven other ultra-liberal House members to issue a statement that they entitled "A New Commitment to the United Nations."

Morse and his colleagues could not have been more effusive in their praise of "the only global machinery for peace," which "for twenty years . . . has helped to prevent and limit international conflict." They were very proud of the UN's promotion of peace in Korea (!), the Congo (!), and the Middle East (!). They were especially anxious that the United States sponsor the UN as a permanent "peacekeeping" force, with the U.S. Military Air Transport System on permanent call to the UN for transporting troops and war matériel. They also wanted an American group of one thousand volunteers for a UN stand-by force for international "relief" work.

Somehow Morse and his colleagues discovered that between 1945 and 1965, "wherever UN operations have been undertaken, the United Nations has promoted peace, and in so doing has served the interests of the United States." Beyond that, they found "as a forum for negotiations, as a focal point for communication between nations, and as a vital inducement to economic and social progress the United Nations is both a symbol of optimism for the future and a very practical instrument for peace."

Morse has always been an enthusiastic supporter of extravagant foreign "aid" legislation. He considers the Republic of South Africa to be villainous but is hopeful that "tensions" will be eased between the United States and Communist China. He was delighted when President Nixon visited Communist Rumania because Morse is a devotee of the "bridges-to-the-East" policy that gained such widespread popularity among leftists during the Johnson Administration.

In military matters, Morse is a pacifist. He has been a firm supporter of disarmament measures. His opinion on the Vietnam War was perhaps best summarized when he said in 1969 that "a military solution is both undesirable and impossible." Two years earlier, he had organized a group of eight House Republican doves who offered to the Johnson Administration an elaborate plan to de-escalate the war in Vietnam.

As spokesman for the doves, Morse described five successive steps to be taken by the United States – over a period of three hundred days – to end the bombing attacks against North Vietnam. At the conclusion of each step, North Vietnam would be expected to reciprocate with a de-escalation measure. Morse insisted that the United States should take the initiative in the de-escalation routine, but he never did explain why.

It was Morse's expectation that when the de-escalation of bombing attacks was completed, the United States and its allies could meet the Communists at a peace table where the two sides could have confidence in each other's word. At no time in his presentation did Morse indicate that he had any awareness of traditional Communist duplicity, nor did he seem to realize that North Vietnam was not alone on the Communist side of the war.

Eventually Morse's hopes for de-escalation by the United States were realized, even though his program was not followed. Of course, the North Vietnamese did not make reciprocal gestures, but in May 1968 the two sides did meet at the negotiating table in Paris. Eleven months later Morse estimated that the United States was making progress in the "peace" talks, although the only agreement reached by that time had been concerned with the shape of the "peace" table.

PHILIP E. MOSELY was born on September 21, 1905 in Westfield, Massachusetts, son of Eliza Rust and Arthur Mosely. He married Ruth Bissell. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1926; Ph.D., 1933). In 1926 and 1927, he pursued graduate studies at Cambridge University. He is the author of *Russian Diplomacy and the Opening of the Eastern Question: 1838-1839* (1934) and *The Kremlin and World Politics* (1960).

In 1929 and 1930, Mosely was an instructor at Princeton University. From 1930 until 1932, he was in Moscow, engaged in historical research. From 1933 until 1935, he was an instructor at Union College. In 1935 and 1936, he did research in the Balkans while holding a fellowship from the leftist-oriented Social Science Research Council. From 1936 until 1943, he was at Cornell University: as assistant professor (1936-1940) and associate professor (1940-1943). From 1943 until 1946, he was in the Department of State: assistant chief of the division of political studies and chief of the division of territorial studies.

During Mosely's years with the Department of State, he served as an advisor to Secretary of State Cordell Hull at the 1943 Moscow Conference, to Ambassador John G. Winant on the European Advisory Commission, to the American negotiators at the Potsdam Conference, and to the Councils of Foreign Ministers at London (1945) and Paris (1946). It was Mosely's lot to have participated in an unbroken series of diplomatic defeats for the United States, the most notable being the partition of Germany and the creation of zones for Berlin.

Since 1946, Mosely has been at Columbia University: as professor of international relations (1946-1955); director of the Russian Institute (1951-1955); adjunct professor (1955-1963); and, since 1963, professor of international relations, director of the European Institute, and associate dean of the international affairs faculty. From 1947 until 1951, he worked for the leftist-oriented Rockefeller Foundation. From 1955 until 1963, he was director of studies for the Council on Foreign Relations. (In 1961, while holding his position with the CFR, Mosely joined with the notorious pacifist and scaremonger, Norman Cousins, to arrange meetings at Dartmouth College and in the Crimea, at which American "private citizens" and Soviet "private citizens" discussed disarmament, peace, the United Nations, and other topics that are legally in the province of the Department of State's diplomatic machinery. Mosely and Cousins, however, as longstanding members of the CFR, simply behaved as if the Department of State were subsidiary to the CFR. Their efforts were financed by the leftist-oriented Ford Foundation.)

Mosely has further distinguished himself in the Liberal Establishment as an editorial advisor and frequent contributor to *Foreign Affairs,* the quarterly journal of the CFR. He has also been a long-time official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle.

WALTER G. MUELDER was born on March 1, 1907 in Boody, Illinois, son of Minnie Horlitz and Epke Muelder. He married Martha Grotewohl. He is an alumnus of Knox College (B.S., 1927) and Boston University (S.T.B., 1930; Ph.D., 1933). In 1933, he was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist Church. He is the author of *Religion and Economic Responsibility* (1953); *In Every Place a Voice* (1957); *Foundations of the Responsible Society* (1959); *Methodism and Society in the Twentieth Century* (1961); and *Moral Law in Christian Social Ethics* (1966). He is the co-author of *An Historical Outline of the Bible* (1936) and *Development of American Philosophy* (1940). He has contributed to many symposia and is the co-editor of *Institutionalism and Church Unity* (1963).

From 1934 until 1940, Muelder was at Berea College as associate professor of theology (1934-1936) and professor (1936-1940). From 1940 until 1945, he was at the University of Southern California as professor of Christian theology and Christian ethics. Since 1945, he has been a dean and professor of social ethics at Boston University's School of Theology, and has been active in the World Council of Churches and the National Council of Churches. In 1964, he was an observer for the World Methodist Council at Vatican Council II.

Muelder has been a persistent foe of all United States nuclear testing and anti-Communist investigating committees. He is a full-blown one worlder and has advocated that the church should work for "effective world loyalty" and against national loyalty.

Muelder has been affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the leftist Highlander Folk School; the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case ("Communist front"); Promoting Enduring Peace (leftwing, pacifist); the Southern Conference Educational Fund (financial backbone of racial agitators, including "black power" revolutionaries); the American Civil Liberties Union (that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness); and the leftwing-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Muelder's name has appeared on a number of petitions and public statements issued by the left wing, including: an appeal to the State Department to issue visas to prominent foreign Communists; appeals for the extension of membership in the United Nations for Red China; a petition to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; appeals on behalf of a soft foreign policy vis-à-vis the Soviet Union and Communist Cuba; a statement denouncing a legislative investigation of Communism in Massachusetts; petitions against the testing of nuclear weapons; and statements urging the abolition of the Selective Service system.

REUBEN H. MUELLER was born on June 2, 1897 in St. Paul, Minnesota, son of Emma Bunse and Reinhold Mueller. He married Magdalene Stauffacher. He is an alumnus of North Central College (A.B., 1919) and the Evangelical Theological Seminary (B.D., 1926). He is the author of *Becoming a Christian* (1930); *Motive in Christian Teaching* (1952); *Renew My Church* (1952); *The Living Word* (1952); and *His Church* (1966).

From 1919 until 1924, Mueller was a high school teacher in Wisconsin and

Minnesota. In 1922, he was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical Church. From 1924 until 1926, he was an instructor at North Central College. Between 1921 and 1937, he held pastorates in Minneapolis, South Bend, and Indianapolis. From 1937 until 1941, he was superintendent for the Indiana Conference of the Evangelical Church, and from 1941 until 1946, was general secretary for Christian education and evangelism for the Evangelical Church in Cleveland. From 1946 until 1954, he was executive secretary for Christian education and associate secretary for evangelism for the Evangelical United Brethren Church. From 1954 until 1968, he was bishop and president of the board of bishops of the Evangelical United Brethren Church. Since 1968, he has been bishop in Indiana of the United Methodist Church.

From 1963 until 1966, Mueller was president of the leftist-oriented National Council of Churches. He has been an active official of the leftist-oriented World Council of Churches. He has been affiliated with the Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union – two leftist-internationalist groups. He has been affiliated with Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation; and with Franklin Littell's Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the defamatory anti-anti-Communist Anti-Defamation League.

ARTHUR W. MUNK was born on April 26, 1909 in Kingsbury, Texas, son of Lydia Stautzenberger and Walter Munk. He married Margaret Caldwell. He is an alumnus of Southwestern University (B.A., 1931), Southern Methodist University (B.D., 1933), and Boston University (Ph.D., 1945). In 1933, he was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist Church.

From 1933 until 1946, Munk served various Methodist Church pastorates in Texas and Massachusetts. From 1946 until 1951, he was an associate professor of religion at Wesley College. Since 1951, he has been at Albion College in Michigan as associate professor of philosophy (1951-1960); professor (1960-1968); chairman of the philosophy department (1951-1968); and since 1968, resident scholar in philosophy.

Munk has been affiliated with the Committee of One Thousand ("Communist created and controlled front organization"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact; the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century; and the Inter-University Committee for a Public Hearing on Foreign Policy, a leftwing group of academicians. In 1956, Munk petitioned for executive clemency to be extended to Communists imprisoned under provisions of the Smith Act. Munk is sympathetic toward the Communist regime in Cuba. He has taken part in peacenik demonstrations and in anti-Vietnam, leftwing read-ins.

JOHN W. NASON was born on February 9, 1905 in St. Paul, Minnesota, son of Mary Eaton and Albert Nason. He was married to the late Bertha White. He is married to Elizabeth Knapp. He is an alumnus of Carleton College (B.A., 1926), Harvard University (M.A., 1928), and Oxford University, where he was a Rhodes scholar (B.A., 1931). In 1926 and 1927, he studied at Yale University's Divinity School.

From 1931 until 1953, Nason was at Swarthmore College: philosophy instructor (1931-1934); assistant professor (1934-1940); assistant to the president (1937-1940); acting chairman of the philosophy department (1938-1939); and president (1940-1953). From 1934 until 1940, he was assistant to the American secretary of the Rhodes Trustees.

From 1953 until 1962, Nason was president of the Foreign Policy Association, which has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism. It has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists.

Since 1962, Nason has been president of Carleton College.

Nason has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a member of the Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union, two of Clarence Streit's leftist, one-world organizations. He has been on the advisory council of the World Affairs Center (leftwing, pacifist). He has been president of the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia and the United Nations Council of Philadelphia – two one-world outfits.

ROBERT R. NATHAN was born on December 25, 1908 in Dayton, Ohio, son of Anna Schnee and Louis Nathan. He married Mary Tillotson. He is an alumnus of the University of Pennsylvania (B.S., 1931; M.A., 1933) and Georgetown University (LL.B., 1938).

From 1931 until 1933, Nathan was a research assistant at the University of Pennsylvania. From 1933 until 1940, he was with the U.S. Department of Commerce as an economist in the bureau of foreign and domestic commerce (1933-1936) and chief of the National Income Division (1936-1940).

From 1940 until 1942, Nathan was assistant director in the bureau of research and statistics of the Office of Production Management. In 1942 and 1943, he was chairman of the War Production Board's planning committee. In 1945, he was deputy director for reconversion in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Since 1946, Nathan has been a consulting economist. He has his own firm – Robert R. Nathan Associates. His clients have included the governments of France, Burma, South Vietnam, Puerto Rico, Colombia, Afghanistan, El Salvador, South Korea, and the United Nations.

Nathan has been national chairman of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. He has been an official of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. He has been on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, which has had a long and consistent record of pro-Communism and anti-anti-Communism, and has been a center for pro-Soviet apologists and United Nations propagandists. He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States, and of the National Committee for an Effective Congress, a group which campaigns for and finances ultra-leftist candidates for the House and Senate, and has been a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development and a member of the national council of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League.

JACK NEWFIELD was born on February 18, 1939 in New York City. He is an alumnus of Hunter College (B.A., 1961). He is the author of *A Prophetic Minority* (1966) and *Robert Kennedy: A Memoir* (1969). He has contributed articles to *Nation, Playboy, Partisan Review,* the *New York Times, Evergreen Review, Boston Globe, Life, Commonweal,* and *Harper's.* Since 1964, he has been on the staff of New York City's avant-garde *Village Voice,* as a reporter and assistant editor.

Newsweek ("RFK's Voice on the Left," May 6, 1968) said: "[Newfield] in four short years has earned a solid reputation as the most voluble and multifaceted spokesman yet to come forward on behalf of the U.S. New Left . . . his wit runs to every radical political organization in the country, and he is at once champion and critic of such variegated New and Old Left politicians and pundits as Michael Harrington [who wrote the introduction to Newfield's *A Prophetic Minority*], Stokely Carmichael, Tom Hayden, James Wechsler, Murray Kempton and H. Rap Brown." Since that commentary was written, Newfield has also championed John Lindsay and Ralph Nader.

Newfield came into national prominence as a very close political associate of the late Robert F. Kennedy during the Kennedy campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1968. Newfield explained the relationship: "Kennedy was the first conventional politician I liked; shy, sensitive, funny. His politics represent a new liberalism. My radicalism reinforces his own instincts. He's a very contemporary guy. I symbolize the millions of kids who hated the war, who hated Johnson."

Newfield is a member of the leftwing-racist Southern Christian Leadership Conference. He has contributed to the defense of Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver. He is an enthusiastic booster for marijuana smoking. He is an abject apologist for race riots. He admires the Viet Cong. ("I'm not a guerrilla. I want to get my ideas to as many people as possible. I believe America is racist, the war is rotten." "[I am] pro-pot, pro-riot and pro-Cong.")

The so-called New Left has adopted Newfield as its literary spokesman in "respectable" publications. For his part, Newfield is somewhat impatient at the lack of progress made by New Leftists: "The New Politics will have to root itself in issues that move masses of people: an end to the endless war in Vietnam, a drastic reduction in military spending; community control, citizen participation, and opposition to the general overcentralization of American life; reform of the draft; democratization of the rules and structures of the Democratic Party; a guaranteed annual income, socialized medicine and the closing of tax loopholes for corporations and the very rich. And possibly most urgently, it must devise a program that addresses the legitimate needs and frustrations of the powerless white working class." (*Commonweal,* July 28, 1969).

Newfield is the epitome of permissiveness and license: he opposes censorship in any form; he has inveighed against congressional investigations of Students for a Democratic Society; he criticizes the police for rounding up the Black Panther revolutionaries; he called the indictment of the 1968 riot leaders (members of "The Conspiracy," which disrupted the Chicago proceedings of the Democratic National Convention) "illegal."

After the death of Robert F. Kennedy, Newfield became very despondent over the lack of political leaders, especially within the Democratic Party: "We are the first generation that learned from experience, in our innocent twenties, that things were not really getting better, that we shall *not* overcome. We felt, by the time we reached thirty, that we had already glimpsed the most compassionate leaders our nation could produce, and they had all been assassinated. And from this time forward, things would get worse: our best political leaders were part of memory now, not hope." He was especially concerned that no Leftist political leader, after Kennedy, could "win the trust – or even the curiosity – of the high school and college activists, a group of about 3 million. I don't mean to suggest that this is an easy thing to do these days. The young today quite properly believe in no adult authority in the country . . . . They are in revolt against the most traditional values of the middle class – God, money, status and the family. One small way in which the New Politics can begin to relate to these kids would be to develop a cultural analysis of America that takes the adversary culture of the young seriously."

Newfield's concern for the success of the Left in politics was exemplified by the analysis he made in the *Nation* (July 28, 1969): "To summarize: the New Politics seems too committed to the Democratic Party as the one historical agency of renewal. It seems too remote from the para-political movements at the base of the society: blacks, students, the poor, women. It has not begun to raise the idea of redistribution of wealth and income. It is white and elite.

"The New Politics should be more activist, more radically concerned with institutions, more concerned with cultural issues, more like a social movement than a political campaign. For example, it should now be leading the opposition to the war in Vietnam, organizing a new March on Washington, or perhaps a national strike. It should lend its support to the basic demands of the campus movements, and not contribute further to the paranoid backlash against the young. It should try to strike alliances with low-income whites on issues of economic self-interest, possibly through the new Alliance for Labor Action. It should be able to grasp the enormity of the present crisis, and realize that the business-as-usual ritual of making good speeches and nominating assemblymen is insufficent as long as 350 Americans are dying each week in Vietnam.

"Right now the New Politics hardly exists, except as a simplistic slogan easily appropriated by hacks and hucksters. What we do have, out of the ashes of 1968, are some *excellent new politicians:* Sam Brown, Adam Walinsky, Paul Schrade, Don Peterson, Julian Bond, Channing Phillips, Representatives [Shirley] Chisolm, [Edward] Koch and [Allard] Lowenstein. But we do not yet begin to have a *new politics* that can generate a new majority for radical reform."

WALDEMAR A. NIELSEN was born on March 27, 1917 in Greensburg, Pennsylvania, son of Mary Shaffer and Malta Nielsen. He married Marcia Kaplan. He is an alumnus of the University of Missouri (A.B., 1939; M.A., 1940). In 1939, he was a Rhodes scholar. He is the author of *African Battleline* (1965) and *Africa* (1965).

From 1941 until 1944, Nielsen was an economic researcher in the Department of Agriculture. In 1946 and 1947, he was an economic researcher in the Department of State. In 1947 and 1948, he was a special assistant to Secretary of Commerce Averell Harriman. From 1948 until 1952, he was with the Office of Information in Europe: deputy director (1948-1951) and director (1951-1952). From 1952 until 1961, he was with the leftist Ford Foundation: deputy director of the behavioral sciences division (1952-1953); assistant to President H. Rowan Gaither Jr. (1953-1955); and deputy director and associate director of the international affairs program (1956-1961). In 1961, using his prestige as a Ford Foundation official, he joined the Kennedy Administration's attack on anti-Communist military leaders with an article ("Huge Hidden Impact of the Pentagon") in the *New York Times Magazine* (June 25, 1961). In the Johnson Administration, he was a consultant to the Department of State and the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Nielsen has had a long history of affiliations within the leftwing Establishment. He has been president of the leftist African-American Institute. He has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. From 1962 until 1968, he was a senior fellow of the CFR. He has been a board member of the leftist-internationalist Experiment in International Living, the leftist-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States, and the leftist-internationalist U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. He has been a trustee of Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism. He has been a long-time official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective vehicle for pro-Communist propaganda.

VICTOR OBENHAUS was born on September 26, 1903 in Superior, Wisconsin, son of Grace Dexter and Herman Obenhaus. He married Marion Pendleton. He is an alumnus of Oberlin College (A.B., 1925), Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1929), and Columbia University (Ed.D., 1940). In 1929, he was ordained to the ministry of the Congregational Christian Church. He is the author of *Hebrew Prophets and America's Conscience* (1948) and *The Responsible Christian* (1957).

From 1929 until 1936, Obenhaus was an assistant minister at the Church of the Covenant in Cleveland, Ohio. From 1936 until 1938, he was on the ministerial staff of Riverside Church in New York City. From 1938 until 1944, he was principal of Pleasant Hill Academy in Tennessee.

Since 1944, he has been on the faculty of the Chicago Theological Seminary as assistant professor of the church in agriculture and industrial life (1944-1948), and as associate professor (1948-1961) and, since 1961, professor, of Christian ethics.

Obenhaus has been affiliated with the National Religion and Labor Foundation (Communist front); the Chicago Sobell Committee ("Communist campaign"); the Chicago Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case ("Communist front"); and the American Civil Liberties Union (that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness). He has supported various Communist projects: petitioning for clemency for the convicted Communist Party leaders Gil Green and Henry Winston; petitioning on various occasions to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities; petitioning for a foreign policy of appeasement vis-à-vis Communist Cuba; and in 1951, petitioning for U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China.

JOHN O. PASTORE was born on March 17, 1907 in Providence, Rhode Island, son of Erminia Asprinio and Michele Pastore. He married Elena Caito. He is an alumnus of Northeastern University (LL.B., 1931). In 1932, he was admitted to the Rhode Island bar and began a private law practice in Providence.

From 1935 to 1937, Pastore served in Rhode Island's House of Representatives. In 1937 and 1938 and from 1940 until 1944, he served in the appointive position of an assistant attorney general. In 1944 and 1945, he was Lieutenant Governor of Rhode Island. From 1945 until 1950, he was Governor of Rhode Island. (Pastore, recalling his gubernatorial years, boasts of being "the father of the sales tax in Rhode Island." As Governor, Pastore established himself as one of the most vocal state chief executives favoring socialistic controls of the nation's economy and society by the federal government.)

Since 1951, Pastore has been in the United States Senate. Throughout his senatorial career, he has proven to be one of the most reliable hacks in the Democrat Party – a position which has gained him very important assignments to the Senate Appropriations Committee, the Senate Commerce Committee, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Senate Democratic Policy Committee. In 1964, he was the keynote speaker at the Democratic National Convention.

During the Johnson Administration, Pastore was one of the leading supporters of so-called civil rights legislation. It was flagrantly apparent that Pastore adopted the liberal tactic of going to war against the southern States in order to promote forcible public school desegregation and revolutionary open-housing laws. And it was his leadership in the civil rights facets of the "great society" program that caused Pastore to be seriously considered for the post of majority whip in 1964, succeeding Hubert Humphrey. He did not achieve the position, however, and his failure to do so may be attributable to his often confusing remarks. For example, when he worked for public school desegregation, he said: "Let the Senate work its will. If one side wins, it wins. If it loses, it loses." On another occasion, he said: "If a black mother with a black child wants that child to go to a school which is predominantly white, I call that freedom of choice. If a white mother wants to remove a child from a school that is predominantly black, or half black and white, in order not to have her child associate in the same schoolroom with black children, that is not freedom of choice. That is a freedom of choice that is prohibited by the Constitution of the United States."

On foreign policy issues, Pastore has generally been a model of inconsistency. At one point in his career, he favored a reduction of foreign aid spending, and what aid was to be given, he thought, should be directed toward friendly nations. He has long since retreated from those selective positions, and in recent years has voted the straight liberal-internationalist line for handouts to foreign countries.

In 1966, Pastore expressed his dislike for nations that traded with Communist powers. A year later, however, he relaxed his firm stand by saying that it was all right for nations to trade non-strategic goods to Communist countries, but admitted that he didn't really know the difference between strategic and non-strategic goods.

In 1961, Pastore was anxious that the United States create a Disarmament Agency for World Peace. (He was very concerned about "world opinion.") In 1963, he was a leading advocate of the nuclear test-ban treaty. (He was very concerned about "world opinion.") In 1966, he was most anxious to stop nuclear proliferation. (He was very concerned about "world opinion.") As is customary with ultra-liberals, Pastore has never explained what constitutes "world opinion" or how he would know whether or not "world opinion" was satisfied by anything the United States might do.

On the matter of the Vietnam War, Pastore early adopted Lyndon Johnson's no-win policy, coupled with Senator Edward Kennedy's hostile attitude toward the Saigon regime.

Pastore frequently advocated free elections as a major solution to problems in Vietnam, but somehow overlooked suggestions as to how and when such elections would be held. At other times, he thought the United Nations should do something about Vietnam, but again he overlooked any specific details which might constitute United Nations action. There were occasions when Pastore didn't seem to know whether he should be a hawk or a dove. In the years-long debate on the anti-ballistic missile system (which he favored, strangely enough), he offered this profundity: "I say this: If we have got to stay in Vietnam, let us do what we must do. If we have got to get out, then let us get out."

SIDNEY M. PECK was born on December 26, 1926 in Annapolis, Maryland, son of Jennie Dlin and Herman Peck. He married Louise Fried. He is an alumnus of the University of Minnesota (B.A., 1949) and the University of Wisconsin (M.S., 1951; Ph.D., 1959). He is the author of *The Rank-and-File Leader* (1963). He has contributed articles to *Studies on the Left,* published by the ultra-leftist Students for a Democratic Society.

In 1951 and 1952, Peck was a sociology instructor at the University of Wisconsin (Madison). In 1952 and 1953 he was a sociology instructor at Carleton College. In 1955 and 1956, he was a sociology instructor at the University of Wisconsin. From 1957 until 1963, he was an associate professor of sociology at Milwaukee-Downer College. Since 1963, he has been an associate professor of sociology at Western Reserve University. In between teaching positions, he has worked in various factories as a punch press operator and sheet metal worker, and in other positions. (*Human Events* has reported that Peck was a member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the Communist Party.)

In 1968, Peck was named by a federal grand jury as a non-indicted co-conspirator in the case against the Chicago Conspiracy of Seven, arising from the riots in Chicago during the 1968 Democratic National Convention. Subsequently, Peck was indicted by the Cook County Grand Jury on two counts of aggravated battery and two counts of resisting arrest. A Professor Sidney Peck Defense Fund was organized by the University Christian Movement of Cleveland, Ohio. In its plea for funds, the UCM produced a brochure which stated in part: "Founding chairman of both the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council and the Ohio Peace Action Council, Peck initiated the formation of the national anti-war coalition and was a prime mover behind the historic peace demonstrations in New York, San Francisco, Washington, and Chicago, during the past several years. As a co-chairman of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, he assumed specific leadership of the March on Washington last November 13-15 [1968], along with Stewart Meacham (American Friends Service Committee) and Cora Weiss (Women's Strike for Peace)."

In 1966, Peck was a leader of the Inter-University Committee for Debate on Foreign Policy, which initiated the teach-ins that plagued university and college campuses with pro-Communist, anti-American agitation against the Vietnam War. He has been affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Alexander Defense Committee to "aid victims of oppression in South Africa" – the "victims" being leftwing racial agitators; and the Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, on behalf of three soldiers who were seeking to evade service in Vietnam. In 1965, he petitioned against the McCarran Internal Security Act, a project of the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front" – "created, dominated, and controlled by members and officials of the Communist Party"). Peck's "peace" activities have made his name a familiar one in favorable notices in the Communist press. In 1970, he attended the Communist-dominated World Conference on Viet Nam, Laos, and Cambodia in Stockholm, Sweden.

CLAIBORNE PELL was born on November 22, 1918 in New York City, son of Matilda Bigelow and Herbert Pell. He married Nuala O'Donnell. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1940) and Columbia University (A.M., 1946). He is author of *Megalopolis Unbound* and co-author of *The Challenge of the Seas.*

In 1944 and 1945, Pell was an instructor at the Navy School of Military Government at Princeton and a lecturer at the Army Civil Affairs Training Schools at Harvard University, Yale University, and Stanford University.

In 1945 and 1946, Pell held minor offices in the Department of State, and in 1945, he worked at the United Nations organizing conference in San Francisco. In 1946 and 1947, he was attached to the United States embassy at Prague, and in 1947 and 1948, he was the consul general at Bratislava, Czecho-Slovakia. In 1949, he was vice consul at Genoa, Italy. From 1950 until 1952, he was at the Department of State in Washington, D.C. At the conclusion of his government service, he became a limited partner in an investment firm.

In 1952, Pell became active in Rhode Island politics as a fund raiser for the Democrat Party. From 1952 until 1954, he was the executive assistant to the chairman of Rhode Island's Democrat Party. From 1953 until 1960, he was a consultant to the Democrat National Committee. He has been a director of the leftwing-internationalist World Affairs Council of Rhode Island. He has been vice president of the Socialist-lined International Rescue Committee.

Since 1961, Pell has been Rhode Island's junior United States Senator. (In 1966, he was given financial support in his successful bid for re-election by the National Committee for an Effective

Congress, whose support is reserved exclusively for ultra-leftist candidates.) In the Eighty-ninth, Ninetieth, and Ninety-first Congresses Pell has served on the prestigious and influential Committee on Foreign Relations. He has a propensity for reminding his audiences that during his tour of duty in Czecho-Slovakia he gained valuable experience in dealings with the Communists; but as a Senator, Pell has displayed muddled and unrealistic thinking whenever he has discussed Communism or Communists. With sycophantic devotion he has followed every twist and turn down the road to appeasement under the direction of the Kennedys (John, Robert, and Edward), Lyndon Johnson, Dean Rusk, Robert S. McNamara, Hubert Humphrey, and Mike Mansfield.

If Pell's vocabulary, when he entered the Senate, lacked any of the liberals' clichés and platitudes, he overcame such deficiencies in short order. In 1962, he favored United States economic "aid" to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland "to encourage independence from Soviet domination within the Communist empire," even though there was not an inkling that previous "aid" to those countries had accomplished anything except to bolster the strength of the Soviet's puppet regimes in Yugoslavia and Poland. In 1963, he advocated "soft goods for hard currency" as "the five-word precept that should guide our trading relationships with the Communist nations," including "the Soviet Union, Communist China, or any other nation which we oppose." He offered the thesis that the Communists would weaken their ability to commit aggression in proportion to the amount of hard currency they spent on American goods.

In 1963, Pell somehow discovered that the United States was excessively preoccupied with Communist Cuba. Although he never indicated the details of this preoccupation, he was disturbed, because he considered the Castro regime merely an aggravation and not a mortal threat. (In 1960, Pell visited Cuba and somehow discovered that the "majority of the Cuban people at that time favored the [Castro] regime.") Then, in 1964, after reading items in the *New York Times, Washington Post,* and *Providence Journal* (three pillars of the soft-on-Communism school of journalism), he came to the realization that these items "make it clear that Fidel Castro has had enough of the U.S. policies of isolation and boycott, and suggest that he would like a change of course in United States-Cuban relations. He clearly wants to renew Cuba's close trading ties with the United States and he clearly reflects a desire on the part of the Soviet Union to be freed of its $1 million a day aid burden in Cuba." Meanwhile, Castro was giving the lie to Pell's fantasy by using every opportunity to denounce the United States and to boast that he was exporting subversion throughout Latin America.

In 1967, Pell campaigned for a United States-Soviet Union consular convention on the ground that it would help to erode the Communist monolithic structure. But how the erosion would take place or what prompted this preposterous *non sequitur*, Pell left unexplained.

In 1968, Pell found himself misquoted in the Soviet government's *Pravda* and *Izvestiya.* His reaction was: "I hope . . . that the Soviet press is not always this inaccurate and does not always distort the news" – an inanity which must have been greeted in the Kremlin with a mixture of hilarity and disbelief.

In July 1968, Pell made a six-day visit to Czecho-Slovakia. He interviewed Communist officials, editors, academicians, journalists, and foreign observers. When he returned to Washington, he urged President Lyndon Johnson to improve United States-Czecho-Slovakia relations in order that the United States might extend credit. Pell had been convinced by Czecho-Slovak leaders that they could continue their democratization-reform movement, instituted in January 1968, without serious risk of Soviet interference. A few weeks later, Pell's bubble of expertise burst when Soviet troops began a massive invasion of Czecho-Slovakia. Pell, however, was not too dismayed. He congratulated Secretary of State Dean Rusk for denying that any alleged imperialist activity in Czecho-Slovakia was in any way related to the United States and for stating that the United States intended "to stay on the sidelines" (while the Soviet troops marched upon the defenseless Czecho-Slovak peoples). Pell also prattled about "conservatives" in the Kremlin.

In November 1968, Pell and Senator Albert Gore (D.-Tenn.) visited Soviet-occupied Prague and then continued on to Moscow, where they consulted with Premier Aleksei Kosygin. Pell found Kosygin to be "a decent man bothered by the course of events." Gore warned Kosygin that events in Czecho-Slovakia might cause the United States to adopt a hard-line, anti-Communist stance. Pell reflected: "In the United States, there has been a sharp hardening in the attitude of the public toward the Soviet Union, an attitude which had shown some disposition to replace emotional anticommunism with a more pragmatic willingness to take Soviet expressions of a desire for peaceful coexistence at face value."

During the most violent days of the crisis in Czecho-Slovakia, Pell was busily pushing for United States acceptance of a non-proliferation treaty with the Soviet Union. He contended that the United States should ignore "the Soviet Union's bullying [!] and heinous tactics in Czecho-Slovakia" and look to the future.

In January 1969, Pell and Gore recommended to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the United States expand its contacts with Eastern Europe in the fields of cultural, scientific, and technological exchange, trade, tourism, and consular relations. They were sad over the continuation of Soviet oppression in Czecho-Slovakia, but as a silver lining to the dark cloud they offered the observation that there was a continuation of "the inevitable erosion of Soviet-designed and Soviet-directed Communism in Eastern Europe, although perhaps at the cost of serious disaffection and disruption even within Mother Russia [*sic*]."

In all areas of foreign affairs, Pell has consistently advocated that the United States should go more than halfway to appease the Communist powers. In 1961, while he worked strenuously to create a United States disarmament agency, he said: "We must continue to demonstrate to the world our true dedication to the cause of peace." And in his context the "world" could only mean the Communist bloc.

In 1963, when Pell spoke in favor of a nuclear test ban treaty, he verged on hysteria: "In the back of many of our minds is the thought that if we do not do something to prevent our present international 'danse macabre' upon the precipice of nuclear coannihilation, one of the dancers will make the inevitable slight misstep and fall into the crater's abyss, and that one will not be immolated alone." Four years later, while fighting adoption of the anti-ballistic missile system, he was still the foreboder of doom: "My fear is that the ABM may in some subtle way erode our restraint and permit our military leaders – and the public, too – to have a kind of unjustified overconfidence which will allow them to take greater risks and press stronger nuclear threats, on the mistaken and tragic assumption that we can afford to inflict astronomical damage because at least some of the retaliation will be diminished."

On the matter of the Vietnam War, Pell has been somewhat less imaginative. He has been content to serve as an echo for Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, Mike Mansfield, Edward Kennedy, or the peacenik lobby in general. He favored Johnson's no-win policy by arguing that Vietnam was "a political, not a tactical war." He announced his willingness to see the United States settle for a Yugoslav type [*sic*] of Communism in Vietnam, because, as he explained, "if ever there was a nationally orientated Communist, it is Ho chi Minh." On the other hand, his attitude toward the South Vietnamese government has been nothing but a paraphrase of Senator Edward Kennedy's hyper-passionate hatred of that government.

In 1967, Pell was hopeful that the United Nations would find the panacea for the troubles in Vietnam. In a speech to the Senate – remarkable for Pell's willingness to surrender United States foreign policy in the form of a blank check to the United Nations – he said: "The fact that the [Vietnamese] participants are not members of the United Nations is immaterial. The United Nations can take cognizance of this problem, if it wishes, and take appropriate action, flushing out those governments which criticize us publicly while sometimes urging us privately on a different course. This is a question of almost fish or cut bait; whether the United Nations wants to continue to sit on its hands, or take a positive approach to the problem. Finally, it would seem to me, if we do send this problem up to the United Nations and are successful in its being seized by the United Nations, we should say in advance that we will abide by the vote of the United Nations, that we will abide by the collective verdict and collective judgment of the United Nations no matter what that verdict will be or how distasteful to us."

Up until 1969, Pell, in common with most leading liberals in Washington, never would acknowledge that North Vietnam could not endure in a war against the United States unless Red China and the Soviet Union wanted such a condition. Yet Pell always opposed an all-out military effort against North Vietnam on grounds that either Red China or the Soviet Union would fill the vacuum caused by North Vietnam's defeat. But by 1969, Pell had become completely defeatist and talked as if the United States had honestly tried and failed to knock out North Vietnam. In light of such a failure, he wanted the United States to follow a futile, attritional enclave policy that could lead to a cease-fire and withdrawal by United States forces.

On other Asian matters, Pell has pressed for United States diplomatic relations with the Mongolian People's Republic. As for Red China, he has urged United States support for a "two-China" policy whereby Red China would eventually replace Free China in the United Nations Security Council, while Free China would be relegated to a seat in the General Assembly. As he advanced this idea, Pell said: "I believe it would be in our national interest to have [Red] China join and be in contact with the United Nations and the family of nations in the belief that her actions and attitudes might be improved. The most efficacious and most painless way of ending communism is by eroding it. And, erosion can only occur when contact is established and surfaces rub."

Toward the United Nations Pell has been as saccharine and uncritical as were the late Eleanor Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson. He has gushed over the United Nations' "contributions [unnamed, of course] to the cause of world peace and stability." He is greatly disturbed that the United States has not ratified the utterly fraudulent UN human rights conventions. And, without the embellishment of a single particular he has stated: "In general, it seems to me we have vastly benefited from the United Nations."

Although Pell's major claim to fame prior to his election to the Senate was his presence in Czecho-Slovakia in 1948, in a brazenly patronizing gesture, he advocated the creation of a Presidential Commission on Negro History and Culture.

When Pell had completed his first term in the Senate, Ernest Cuneo of the North American Newspaper Alliance wrote: "Senator Pell is anything but a comet; but assuredly, in the national heavens, there is a slowly rising star of great magnitude." Tip to stargazers: Look leftward for Pell.

JAMES A. PERKINS was born on October 11, 1911 in Philadelphia, son of Emily Taylor and H. Norman Perkins. He married Jean Bredin. He is an alumnus of Swarthmore College (A.B., 1934) and Princeton University (M.A., 1936; Ph.D., 1937).

From 1937 until 1941, Perkins was at Princeton University as instructor of political science (1937-1939) and assistant director of the School of Public and International Affairs (1939-1941). From 1941 until 1943, he was director of the pulp and paper division in the Office of Price Administration. From 1943 until 1945, he was assistant to the administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration. From 1945 until 1950, he was vice president of Swarthmore College. From 1951 until 1963, he was with the Carnegie Corporation as executive associate (1950-1951) and vice president (1951-1963). From 1954 until 1963, he was with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as secretary (1954-1955) and vice president (1955-1963). [The Carnegie complex has a long history of promoting leftism, pacifism, statism, and internationalism.]

From 1963 until 1969, Perkins was president at Cornell University. His most notable achievement at Cornell was his formation in 1965 of the Committee on Special Education Projects to recruit "underprivileged" Negroes as students. Within a short time, Negroes had formed an Afro-American Society at Cornell, and had their own segregated living quarters and a "black studies" program. In April 1969, during Parents' Weekend, a group of the "underprivileged" Negro students, armed with rifles and shotguns, seized Willard Straight Hall on the Cornell campus. President Perkins cancelled a speech (titled "The Stability of the University") which he was going to deliver to the visiting parents. Within a few days, he led the administration and faculty into a surrender to the black militants' demands. The meeting at which the capitulation took place was described by Perkins as "one of the most positive forces ever set in motion in the history of Cornell." He added: "I hope to expunge to the fullest extent possible the seizure of Willard Straight Hall." As he dropped the armed uprising down the memory hole, his audience cheered and saluted him with clenched fists. A short time later, he recommended to the University's board of trustees that they replace him as Cornell's president.

Since 1969, Perkins has been chairman of the board and director of the Center for Educational Enquiry at Princeton University. When he took the position, he announced that the Center would concentrate its efforts on "governance and modernization of the university both in this country and abroad; the university's responsibilities in international education; international strategies for educational development, and a more equitable access and transition to higher and professional education by black Americans." For his utopian enterprise, Perkins was promised generous aid from the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

Perkins has long been an important figure in the Liberal Establishment. In the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations his services as a consultant and advisor were in great demand. He was chairman of the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, chairman of the President's Advisory Panel for a National Academy on Foreign Affairs, a member of the President's Special Committee on Nuclear Proliferation, a member of the Department of Defense's Education Advisory Committee, a member of the Committee for Improvement of Management in Government, and a general advisor to the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Perkins has been a trustee of two major "think factories" – the Rand Corporation and the Institute for Defense Analyses, both of which have had considerable influence on the defense posture and diplomatic strategy of the United States. (In 1957, Perkins was a member of the Gaither Committee, which issued a highly controversial scare-mongering report that found Soviet military and industrial capacity to be accelerating much faster than that of the United States. In time, the Gaither Report proved to be an expensive work of fiction.) He has been a member of the United States Commission for [Red-saturated] UNESCO. He has long been a resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

ESTHER PETERSON was born on December 9, 1906 in Provo, Utah, daughter of Annie Nielsen and Lars Eggertsen. She married Oliver Peterson. She is an alumna of Brigham Young University (A.B., 1927) and Columbia University's Teachers College (M.A., 1930).

From 1927 until 1929, Mrs. Peterson was a teacher at Southern Utah Agricultural College. From 1930 until 1936, she was a gymnasium teacher at the Winsor School in Boston. During the latter period, she was also a volunteer teacher at the YMCA; became involved in labor strikes of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union; helped to organize the Teachers' Union; and was recreation director at Bryn Mawr's summer school for women workers in industry. In 1938 and 1939, she was a teacher during summer sessions of the Hudson Shore Labor School in New York. From 1939 until 1944, she was assistant director of education for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. From 1945 until 1947, she was a Washington lobbyist for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and a member of the advisory committee to the U.S. Department of Labor's women's bureau. From 1947 until 1957, she was abroad with her husband, who was in the Foreign Service of the Department of State. From 1958 until 1961, she was a lobbyist for the industrial union department of the AFL-CIO.

From 1961 until 1969, Mrs. Peterson served in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. She was Assistant Secretary of Labor for wage and labor standards (1961-1969); executive vice chairman (Eleanor Roosevelt was chairman) of the presidential commission on the status of women (1961-1963); executive vice chairman of the interdepartmental committee on status on women (1963-1965); chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests (1964-1967); and special assistant to the President for consumer affairs (1964-1967).

During the Johnson Administration, Mrs. Peterson became one of the most widely-publicized agitators for paternalism and statism as she donned the mantle of a crusader for consumers. For several years, she developed an avalanche of suggested rules, regulations, and laws to protect consumers from advertisers, wholesalers, and retailers. With an almost total disdain for the intelligence of American consumers, she decided to have government lead them by the hand through the intricacies of instalment buying, supermarket buying, and television viewing. (She once circulated advice to women to leave their husbands and children at home while shopping in supermarkets because the husbands and children would be such distractions that the women would not purchase wisely.)

Mrs. Peterson was distressed that so few high schools and junior high schools taught any course entitled Consumer Education and was convinced that by using governmental pressure the situation could be drastically changed. At one point in her crusade she cited a survey of thirty-three college-educated women who could not select the most economical products in a market. From that and similarly flimsy evidence, she proclaimed: "As we shift from a predominantly producer-oriented to a consumer-oriented economy, our schools must reflect that transformation." Along the way, with slight changes in phraseology, she expanded on this theme: "In a consumption-directed economy, anything would be permissible. Deceptive and false advertising would be perfectly okay as long as it made people buy. Planned obsolescence as a means of increasing consumption would be the rule rather than the exception. In this kind of a system, skill, craftsmanship, and quality are unimportant. All that is important is that there be many things to buy and that they be bought. This system frowns on frugality and financial planning and promotes over-extended credit buying." She was distressed that high-school dropouts and young married couples could not evaluate the prices of goods or rates of interest or the quality of clothing in the "consumption-directed" society. On the other hand, in a consumer-directed society, she said that the individual is treated as a person whose natural inclination is toward human excellence, self-improvement, and esthetic improvement of his environment.

Mrs. Peterson was anxious that the United States emulate such socialist bastions as Sweden, Norway, Germany, and Britain by enlarging consumer education in schools. She further propounded the theory that, though there would always be sources of conflict between merchants and consumers, the federal government's goal "should be to identify areas of tension and devote a good deal of energy to minimizing them."

American supermarkets were special targets of Mrs. Peterson's wrath. Somehow she discovered that the failure of supermarkets to locate in slum districts was "disturbing to all Americans of conscience," and thought that the government should take steps to force large chains to place more stores in such districts. She attacked food sales promotions by supermarkets – trading stamps, contests, and other devices; encouraged consumer boycotts and picket lines against supermarkets; and insisted that supermarkets discriminated against the poor. The Congress created the National Commission on Food Marketing to study supermarkets. The Commission found that, regardless of neighborhood location, the prices charged by chain supermarkets and large independent markets were almost identical.

Mrs. Peterson fulminated against supermarkets' profits, against the packaging and labeling of goods on supermarket shelves, and against the spread between wholesale and retail prices for food. In the same vein, she attacked the advertising industry ("consumers do have a right to expect that each commercial will add to his [*sic*] stock of knowledge"), the cosmetic industry, and the advertisers of cigarettes, tires, prescription drugs, threads, dyes, household appliances, and synthetic fibres.

Mrs. Peterson, in her role as director of the women's bureau in the Department of Labor, was also a staunch enemy of discrimination against women in private industry, where, by her standards, they did not hold a high enough proportion of executive and administrative jobs. In flagrant disregard for the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States, she had high hopes that the federal government would eliminate such alleged inequities in the *private* sector.

Since leaving the government service, Mrs. Peterson has been active on public platforms, disseminating her paternalist-statist views. She remains active in Democratic Party politics. She has been affiliated with the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action, the leftist League of Women Voters, and Franklin Littell's Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the defamatory anti-anti-Communist Anti-Defamation League.

CALVIN H. PLIMPTON was born on October 7, 1918 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Fanny Hastings and George Plimpton. He married Ruth Talbot. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (B.A., 1939), Harvard University (M.D., 1943; M.A., 1947), and Columbia University (Med. Sci. D., 1951).

From 1947 until 1950, Plimpton was an intern, assistant resident, and resident in medicine at the Presbyterian Hospital in New York City. From 1950 until 1960, he was an assistant attending physician at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center. From 1950 until 1960, he was on the faculty at Columbia University's College of Physicians and Surgeons: associate in medicine (1950-1959) and assistant professor of clinical medicine (1959-1960). From 1957 until 1959, he was a professor of medicine at American University in Beirut. Since 1960, he has been president of Amherst College.

Plimpton was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective vehicle for pro-Commu-propaganda. He is a trustee of the World Peace Foundation, which exerts considerable influence upon the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the Central Intelligence Agency in an overall program of appeasement toward the Soviet Union.

FRANCIS T.P. PLIMPTON was born on December 7, 1900 in New York City, son of Frances Pearsons and George Plimpton. He married Pauline Ames. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (A.B., 1922) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1925).

From 1926 until the present, with the exception of a few years in government service, Plimpton has practiced law with a New York City firm. In 1932 and 1933, he was a solicitor with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In 1961, he was appointed to the rank of Ambassador and assigned to the U.S. mission to the United Nations, where he was a deputy to his personal friend and ideological soul-mate, Ambassador Adlai E. Stevenson. He shared Stevenson's leftist-internationalist views and his predilection for the United Nations. When Stevenson died, Plimpton remained at the UN for a few months as head of the U.S. mission.

Plimpton is a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has served as a director of the leftist-internationalist UN Association of the United States. He was a director of the Foreign Policy Association from 1935 until 1949 – a period during which the FPA and its publications served as highly effective pro-Communist vehicles, mainly through the influence of Vera Micheles Dean, a notorious fellow-traveler.

PAUL A. PORTER was born on October 6, 1904 in Joplin, Missouri, son of Dolly Carpenter and John Porter. He was married to and divorced from Bessie Benton. He is married to Kathleen Winsor. He studied at Kentucky Wesleyan College (1923-1926) and at the University of Kentucky Law College (1926-1929).

From 1926 until 1929, Porter was the city editor of the *Lexington* (Ky.) *Herald.* In 1928 and 1929, he practiced law in Kentucky. Between 1929 and 1932, he was editor of the *Mangum* (Okla.) *Daily News* and the *LaGrange* (Ga.) *News*. From 1932 until 1937, he was a special counsel in the Department of Agriculture. From 1937 until 1942, he was the Washington (D.C.) counsel for the Columbia Broadcasting System. In 1942 and 1943, he was a deputy administrator in the Office of Price Administration and an associate administrator in the War Food Administration. In 1943 and 1944, he was associate director of the Office of Economic Stabilization. In 1944, he was the campaign publicity director for the Democratic National Committee. From 1944 until 1946, he was chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. In 1946, he was administrator of the Office of Price Administration, and in the same year was chief (with ambassadorial rank) of the American Economic Mission to Greece.

In 1946, Porter returned to the practice of law in Washington, D.C. He formed a partnership with two notable leftists, Thurman Arnold and Abe Fortas. The three were prominent in the Owen Lattimore story when that "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy" was under the fire of the late Senator Joseph R. McCarthy.

In the early days of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action, Porter was an officer and financial supporter of the organization. He has been affiliated with the leftist American Committee on Africa; Clarence Streit's Atlantic Union Committee and International Movement for Atlantic Union, two leftist-globalist outfits; Freedom House, a center for anti-anti-Communism; and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL JR. was born on November 29, 1908 in New Haven, Connecticut, son of Mattie Schafer and Adam Powell. He was married to and divorced from Isabel Washington and Hazel Scott. He is married to Yvette Diago-Flores. He is an alumnus of Colgate University (A.B., 1930), Columbia University (M.A., 1932), and Shaw University (D.D., 1935). He also attended briefly the Union Theological Seminary. Since 1937, when he succeeded his father, Powell has been pastor of the Abyssinian Baptist Church in Harlem.

From 1932 until 1940, Powell was an instructor at Columbia University Extension School's department of religious education. In 1936, he was a co-founder of the National Negro Congress. The NNC operated in the field of civil rights under Communist Party domination and was headed by responsible Communist Party functionaries. (Once the National Negro Congress was formed, Powell was on his way to leadership of the Negro community in Harlem. He has retained this position even though his racial antecedents have long been debatable. In *Look* magazine of May 7, 1963, Ernest Dunbar wrote in "The Audacious World of Adam Powell": "Powell's origins are as clouded in controversy as is his congressional role. His father . . . who was born in Franklin County, Va., wrote: 'I know less than little about my ancestors,' but said his maternal grandmother was 'dominated largely by Indian blood and traits.' The elder Powell added, 'My mother's father was a German. I never saw him, but was told he was handsome and brilliant.' Adam Jr. told me he had no way of proving he had Negro blood, but said his maternal grandmother was an octoroon, the housekeeper and mistress of a white New York beer baron, then living in Virginia. Powell's mother was reared in the brewer's home, and given his surname. Congressman Powell said his father's mother was part Cherokee Indian. When asked if this lineage meant that he was white, not Negro, Powell gave a shrug and replied, 'If I have all white blood, and I'm doing what I am for the Negro, then I deserve all the more credit!' ")

In 1941, Powell was elected to the City Council of New York. He was supported in his campaign by Democrats and Republicans, the Communist-dominated American Labor Party, and the Communist Political Association of New York, the wartime name for the Communist Party.

In 1942, Powell founded the *People's Voice*, a weekly tabloid, of which he was co-publisher and editor-in-chief. As early as 1942, he wrote an editorial in *People's*

Voice demanding Congressional action on "civil rights." The demand was augmented by Powell's battle-cry: "Praise the Lord . . . and pass the bayonets."

In a brilliant analysis of Powell's career, Maureen L. Buckiey (in "The Ordeal of Adam Clayton Powell," *National Review,* June 8, 1957), wrote: "Communists and pro-Communists proved to be Powell's most conspicuous associates in progressivism. In his capacity as co-chairman or co-speaker . . . on this committee or that program, he virtually commuted back and forth from Madison Square Garden. In 1944 he shared top billing with Earl Browder and William Z. Foster at a giant Party rally. *The Daily Worker,* the *New Masses* and the entire fold praised him continually and ardently supported his candidacies. Powell joyously and gratefully listed, in his campaign literature, his membership in such renowned Communist fronts as the National Negro Congress, the Council of American Soviet Friendship, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties.

"Powell's alliance of convenience with the Communist Party was regularized . . . when he founded the *People's Voice* . . . . Although in six weeks the paper claimed 200,000 readers, it soon ran into serious financial trouble. Dr. Max Yergan, then a staunch party-liner, and Ferdinand Smith, Communist leader of the National Maritime Union, paid off the paper's debts – in return for 51 per cent of the stock.

"[Powell] continued to be editor-in-chief until 1946. He incautiously makes a point of saying that he retained full editorial control throughout that time. If so, he is responsible for pressing such piquant political positions as that after 1945 the Communists would play 'an even more vital role than before in unifying progressive white and Negro Americans in the struggle against their common oppressors'; and that – endorsing a statement by W.E.B. DuBois – 'Never before [has] . . . a suppressed mass of poor, working people – people as ignorant, poor, superstitious and cowed as my own American Negroes – [been] so lifted in hope and starry-eyed with new determination as the peasants and workers of Russia . . . . '

"Powell wrote a column in *PV* called 'The Soapbox' . . . [which] had its heroes as well as its villains. 'This week,' Powell wrote, 'I congratulate the fighting people's paper, the *Daily Worker,* on the achievement of its twentieth year of a consistent battle for mankind's rights . . . . '

"It was not until February 1947 that Powell abandoned *PV.* Powell, the paper reported, branded as 'absolutely a lie' and a 'vicious piece of red-baiting' the story attributed by the *New York Sun* to his secretary – that Powell had resigned because *PV* was 'loaded with pro-Moscow Party members.' Doxie Wilkerson, who had been executive editor for several years, and was a member of the national committee of the Communist Party, succeeded Powell as editor."

In 1942, Powell wrote *Is This a White Man's War?* The book was an extraordinary expression of racism. By Powell's logic, the United States remained aloof from World War II while the war concerned "yellow against yellow, white against black, and white against white . . . . Pearl Harbor, however, was yellow against white and the war came immediately with the race baiters roaring their approval."

In 1944, Powell was elected to the House of Representatives in the 79th Congress. He brought his racial consciousness to the Congress, where he proclaimed in 1946 that "the best thing that could happen would be the passing of . . . the white man's world [which] has stood for nationalism, racism, militarism, oppression and barbarism." During his first year in Congress, he wrote *Marching Blacks.* In that book, he called for five million Negroes to leave the South and go to areas where they might be politically powerful. And it was quite obvious that Powell was hopeful that he would gain recognition as the national spokesman for the politically powerful Negroes. (Powell was presumptuous enough in *People's Voice* for July 21, 1945, to speak for all American Negroes: "Negro-Americans admire and feel close to the Soviet Union. We are impressed by Russia's complete abolition of racial discrimination, by the job, health and other forms of social security which the USSR guarantees to all of its nearly 200 million people, and by its consistent fight to destroy fascism and free the colonial peoples. Negroes, therefore, generally avoid the anti-Soviet traps set by the imperialist war-makers.")

After Powell's first term in office, he was re-elected to Congress with monotonous regularity, against nothing more than token opposition. In Congress, his voting record has always been that of a Democrat Party hack and no piece of legislation has been too far leftward for his support. His pro-labor and pro-Socialist voting record is unexcelled in contemporary Congressional history, even though his attendance record in Congress has always been very poor.

One of the most bizarre features of Powell's career is that he was given an appointment to the House Committee on Education and Labor and in 1961, through seniority, he became the committee's chairman. In this capacity, during the next six years, he controlled – as he boasted – the flow of all legislation pertaining to education and labor. As chairman, Powell earned the praise of Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, whose leftwing legislation he promoted. (In 1961, when a testimonial banquet was held in New York City celebrating Powell's appointment to the chairmanship, President Kennedy dispatched two members of his Cabinet [Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg and Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff] to pay homage to Powell. Goldberg and Ribicoff performed their appointed tasks as principal speakers at the banquet. Mr. Kennedy's protocol chief, Angier Biddle Duke, served as chairman of the banquet's sponsoring committee.)

During his Congressional career, Powell has been less than circumspect in financial matters. Three of his secretaries were indicted for tax evasion. Evidence was given under oath that at least one of these secretaries had kicked her salary back to Powell, and she was convicted on charges of tax evasion. Powell's income tax returns for 1950 to 1955, inclusive, were under investigation by the Justice and Treasury Departments until the Eisenhower Administration arbitrarily ended the investigation. (The circumstances of White House interference were indicative of Powell's shoddy politics. On October 7, 1956, Powell told the congregation of his Abyssinian Baptist Church that as a Negro he could not campaign for either Adlai Stevenson or Dwight Eisenhower because both major parties "take Negro money and send it to Mississippi and other states to build separate schools." Four days later, Powell conferred with Eisenhower at the White House. When he emerged from the conference, Powell announced that he would campaign for Eisenhower. Shortly thereafter Powell's imprisoned secretary was paroled, and a few months later the investigation of Powell's income tax returns was dropped by the Justice Department. New York's Governor Averell Harriman thought Powell's endorsement of Republican Eisenhower was strange. But two years later when Democrat Harriman ran for re-election against Republican Nelson Rockefeller, Powell endorsed Harriman after a conference with the Democrats' leader Carmine DeSapio. There were members of the press and Congress so crass as to suggest that Powell was bribed to endorse Eisenhower and Harriman.)

In 1960, legal and financial troubles beset Powell in unprecedented fashion. They all began when he charged that a Harlem widow, Mrs. Esther James, collected graft for the police. Mrs. James instituted litigation against Powell which, by 1967, involved more than eighty judges, ten courts, four juries, at least fifteen lawyers, and the House of Representatives. Eventually, Mrs. James was given a judgment against Powell amounting to more than $150,000. Then, in 1968, she sued Powell for one million dollars for punitive and compensatory damages. Throughout the years, Powell intermittently used his Congressional immunity to avoid court appearances, boycotted courtrooms on other occasions, ignored subpoenas, and in general showed utter contempt for judicial processes.

Meanwhile, Powell's colleagues in the House of Representatives investigated his conduct. They found, among other things, that Powell had obtained by fraud and forgery more than $40,000 of government funds. In 1967, a Democratic caucus removed Powell as chairman of the Committee on Labor and Education. The House then voted to exclude him from his House seat. Said Powell of the action: "This marks the end of the U.S. as the land of the free and the home of the brave."

Powell was re-elected to the House in a special election in 1967, but made no attempt to reclaim his seat. In 1968, he was again re-elected in a campaign which he described as one against "white racism." In January 1969, Powell was allowed to resume his seat in the House, but was stripped of seniority and fined $25,000 for the misuse of public funds. (A federal grand jury, empaneled in Washington to investigate allegations against Powell, concluded its term in December 1968 without taking a vote on whether to indict Powell. The whitewash of Powell was consummated when the Justice Department concluded that available evidence on the alleged misuse of public funds by Powell failed to warrant public prosecution.)

In the meantime, Powell filed suit to have the courts overthrow the action by which he had been excluded from the House in 1967. In June 1969, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the House had improperly excluded Powell from membership. Powell then began litigation to recover two years' back pay and to challenge the $25,000 fine which had been levied against him.

While Powell's financial transgressions were making headlines, he was not distracted from his leftwing and racist activities. In 1959, he visited Cuba to pay homage to Fidel Castro, who was fresh from his Communist takeover of that unhappy island. In 1965, Powell was demanding that the United States re-establish diplomatic and commercial relations with Cuba.

In recent years, Powell has not seemed to bother with formal affiliations to Communist fronts. But in the 1930's and 1940's he established himself as a fellow traveler through associations with Communist causes and projects – which he has never recanted. Among his affiliations were: the Allied Voters against Coudert ("Communist front"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American Committee for Spanish Freedom ("Communist"); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the American League against War and Fascism ("subversive and Communist"); the American Round Table on India ("Communist front"); the American Youth Congress ("subversive and Communist"); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the China Aid Council ("Communist-controlled"); the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder ("Communist"); the Committee of Sponsors for the Celebration of 15 Years of Biro Bidjan ("Communist front"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Consumers' National Federation ("Communist front"); the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights ("Communist front"); the International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism ("Communist front"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Emergency Conference ("Communist front"); the National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights ("Communist front"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National People's Committee against Hearst ("subsidiary" organization of the American League for Peace and Democracy – "subversive and Communist"); the National Wartime Conference of the Professions, the Sciences, the Arts, the White-Collar Fields ("Communist front"); the Non-Partisan Committee for the Re-election of Congressman Vito Marcantonio ("Communist front"); the *Protestant* ("Communist front"); the *Protestant Digest* ("Communist Party line"); the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee ("Communist front"); the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist"); the Wartime Budget Conference ("Communist front"); the National Scottsboro Committee of Action ("Communist front"); and, the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby").

Although Powell's name has faded from Communist front letterheads and petitions, he has brought his leftism to bear on the racial agitation that has convulsed the nation in recent years. He has associated himself with such extremists in the racial agitation movement as H. Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Julian Bond, A. Philip Randolph, Floyd McKissick, and Charles Kenyatta – leader of the Harlem Mau Mau Society. It was Powell who first raised the cry of "black power" during a baccalaureate ceremony at Howard University in 1966. (Powell did not see eye-to-eye with Martin L. King Jr., whom he called an "Uncle Tom" in March 1968. But, a month later, when King was murdered, Powell charged that he had been killed by white racism. For Powell, "white racism is nothing but the attitude and framework for an ultimate policy of genocide against black people.")

For those who follow him, Powell's view of America cannot be anything but inflammatory. Said Powell in April 1968: "The white man is finished. I don't call for violence or riots, but the day of Martin Luther King has come to an end. I don't care whether you agree with Stokely [Carmichael] or Rap [Brown]. That doesn't matter, and I tell you white people that it doesn't matter if you like us. We are out there, and if you are going to get someplace, you've got to go with us, and if the white man wants to go, then he will have to take orders from us." A few days later, Powell said: "First we [Americans] shoot to kill looters and shoot to kill arsonists. Then we shoot to maim persons for disorderly conduct, then breach of the peace, and finally we shoot niggers just for being niggers." Eight months after Powell uttered these vicious lies, he began his service in the 90th Congress with assignments to the Committee on Education, the General Subcommittee on Labor, and the Select Subcommittee on Education.

CHARLES C. PRICE was born on July 13, 1913 in Passaic, New Jersey, son of Helen Farley and Thornton Price. He married Mary White. He is an alumnus of Swarthmore College (A.B., 1934) and Harvard University (M.A., 1935; Ph.D., 1936).

From 1936 until 1946, Price was at the University of Illinois in the department of chemistry: as research assistant (1936-1937); instructor (1937-1939); associate (1939-1941); assistant professor (1941-1942); and associate professor (1942-1946). From 1946 until 1954, he was at the University of Notre Dame: as head of the chemistry department (1946-1952) and professor of chemistry (1946-1954). Since 1954, he has been at the University of Pennsylvania: as director of the chemistry department (1954-1965), and since 1965, as the Benjamin Franklin professor of chemistry.

Price has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist American Association for the United Nations. Since at least 1961, he has been a member of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been on the board of directors of the Council for a Livable World, an ultra-leftwing pacifist and political pressure group, making an especial appeal to the scientific community with its pleas for abject accommodation with the Communist bloc. He has been a long-time member, and from 1959 until 1961 was president, of the ultra-leftist United World Federalists.

JOACHIM PRINZ was born on May 10, 1902 in Burkhardsdorf, Germany, son of Nani Berg and Joseph Prinz. He came to the United States in 1937 and was naturalized in 1944. He was married to the late Lucie Horovitz, and is now married to Hilde Goldschmidt. He is an alumnus of the University of Giessen (Ph.D., 1924). He also studied at the University of Berlin and at the Jewish Theological Seminary in Breslau, and was ordained a rabbi in 1925. He is the author of *The Dilemma of the Modern Jew* (1962) and *Popes from the Ghetto* (1966).

From 1926 until 1937, Prinz was rabbi for the Jewish community in Berlin. He was expelled from Germany in 1937. From 1937 until 1939, he lectured in the United States. Since 1939, he has been rabbi of Temple B'nai Abraham in Newark, New Jersey. Since

1958, he has been a high official of the American Jewish Congress: its president from 1958 to 1966, and since 1966, chairman of its commission on international affairs.

Prinz has been affiliated with the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the Churchman Associates (a leftwing group in support of *The Churchman,* edited by the late pro-Soviet propagandist, Guy Emery Shipler); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

Prinz was affiliated with the Civil Rights Congress of New Jersey in its drive to defeat the anti-Communist Mundt Bill. He petitioned the President of the United States to extend clemency to Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, convicted for contempt of Congress. He signed a public statement urging repeal of the anti-Communist Smith Act, the Internal Security Act, and the Communist Control Act.

WHITELAW REID was born on July 26, 1913 in Purchase, New York, son of Helen Rogers and Ogden Reid. He was married to and divorced from Joan Brandon. His second wife is Elizabeth Brooks. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1936).

From 1938 until 1965, Reid was associated with the now-defunct Reid family enterprise, the *New York Herald-Tribune.* He served the newspaper as a reporter, foreign correspondent, editor, director, and chairman of the board. He is currently president of Reid Enterprises and Drinx Plus Company.

Reid was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an election year's drive by the Democrat Party against anti-Communists. Since at least 1949, he has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist International Movement for Atlantic Union. Since at least 1961, he has been a trustee of Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent. In 1960, he was on the Freedom House Bookshelf Committee, a group of leftists who selected books by leftists to enlighten "leaders and scholars in Africa, Asia and Latin America."

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF was born on April 9, 1910 in New Britain, Connecticut, son of Rose Sable and Samuel Ribicoff. He married Ruth Siegel. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago (LL.B., 1933). He was admitted to the Connecticut bar in 1933 and since that time, with interruptions for public service, has maintained a private law practice in his home state.

From 1938 until 1942, he served two terms in the Connecticut legislature. From 1941 until 1943 and from 1945 until 1947, he was a municipal court judge in Hartford. From 1949 until 1953, he served two terms in the United States House of Representatives. (In 1952, he was an unsuccessful Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate.) In 1954, he was elected Governor of Connecticut; he was re-elected in 1958.

In 1956, at the Democratic National Convention, Ribicoff placed John F. Kennedy's name in nomination for the vice presidency of the United States. In 1960, Ribicoff was one of the first prominent Democrats to endorse John F. Kennedy for President, and at the

1960 Democratic National Convention he was Kennedy's floor manager. In 1961, he was Kennedy's first cabinet appointment as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and in 1962, he became the first of the Kennedy cabinet to resign. In that same year, he was elected to the U.S. Senate, and he was re-elected in 1968.

In the Congress, Ribicoff has always been to the left-of-center on all major issues. On domestic matters he has been a complete statist, working for enlarged federal programs in the areas of welfare, social security, subsidies for police education, school lunch programs, child day care centers, gun control, and all sorts of subsidies and controls for health measures. His commitment to liberalism has been expressed by his sponsorship of legislation calling for a cabinet-level department of education. At the same time, he specifically wanted a provision that would prohibit federal control of education. But no matter his semantics, Ribicoff is a complete centralist working for federal domination of all major education areas. In the same vein, he has worked for federal domination of housing programs and urban development. For example, in 1967, he offered a *trillion-dollar* plan to save U.S. cities by 1980. And he has stopped just short of unequivocal advocacy of nationalized-socialized medicine.

Throughout his congressional career, Ribicoff has been a civil rightist – a strong, but not too vocal, supporter of civil rights legislation in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. However, he did cause some consternation among liberals when, in 1970, he reaped nationwide publicity by demanding that federal enforcement of desegregation be as strong in the North as in the South. He insisted that he did not like *de jure* or *de facto* segregation anywhere in the country. But his leftism was apparent as he offered the standard bleeding-heart line that "racism is rampant throughout the country" and bemoaned "the tension and the hatred that disfigure our nation."

On foreign policy, Ribicoff has always cast a reliable leftwing-internationalist vote. His attitude on the Vietnam War, however, has been a study in equivocation. While Lyndon Johnson was in the White House, Ribicoff steered a cautious course. He supported the Johnson no-win policy, and at the same time advocated more active participation by the United Nations in the war. In 1968, when Johnson was in his political twilight, Ribicoff visited Vietnam, and upon his return expressed fear that U.S. escalation of its war effort would lead to war with Red China. He discounted the domino theory. He talked as if there had been an all-out attempt to bomb North Vietnam into submission but the attempt had failed, and advocated that bombing should therefore be sharply curtailed. On March 21, 1968, he fluttered into the ranks of the congressional doves by saying that Johnson had been "a great President"; but, he added, "my feelings on Vietnam . . . are closer to Gene McCarthy's and Robert Kennedy's." By 1969, Ribicoff was completely on the side of the appeasers.

Ribicoff has followed the liberal clique in the Congress by supporting any and all disarmament measures. He was particularly pleased with the 1967 Johnson-Kosygin meeting, which Ribicoff felt was a major step to further disarmament. When the meeting was concluded, he remained silent on the lack of anything in the way of tangible results. (Ribicoff's enthusiasm for the Johnson-Kosygin meeting was not without precedent. In

1951, when he was in the House of Representatives, he engaged in an absolutely futile gesture by co-authoring and introducing a resolution which affirmed that the "American people deeply regret the artificial [*sic*] barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," that the American people wanted to share with the Soviet peoples "all that is good" in atomic energy, and work with them "in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood." The resolution passed in the Senate on a voice vote. Only six members of the House voted against it. And President Truman compounded the inanity by incorporating the resolution into a letter to the Soviet Presidium, where it suffered a quiet death.)

Since the outbreak of the Israeli-Arab six-day war in 1967, Ribicoff has been a very hawkish supporter of Israel's cause, almost as if Israel were a major part of his constituency.

JOHN RICHARDSON JR. was born on February 4, 1921 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Hope Hemenway and John Richardson. He married Thelma Ingram. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1943; LL.B., 1949).

From 1949 until 1955, Richardson practiced law in New York City with the firm of Sullivan and Cromwell. (Notable alumni from the same firm include Allen and John Foster Dulles.) From 1955 until 1969, he was an investment banker in New York City. During the Nixon Administration, he has been in the Department of State as the assistant secretary of state for educational and cultural affairs.

From 1961 until 1968, Richardson was president of Radio Free Europe, which was represented as a private organization expressing the opinions of individual American citizens who supported it through their contributions. In fact, however, RFE was an operation controlled, and in great part financed, by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Richardson is a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century. Since at least 1957, he has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Since at least 1958, he has been an official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. Since at least 1964, he has been a trustee of Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent.

PAUL ROBESON was born on April 9, 1898 in Princeton, New Jersey, son of Anna Bustill and William Robeson. He married Eslanda Goode. He is an alumnus of Rutgers College (B.A., 1919) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1922). In 1921, he began his life-long career in the entertainment business. He has been an actor, singer, and recording artist. He has made stage, film, and concert appearances in the United States, Europe, and the Soviet Union.

Edwin P. Hoyt in his *Paul Robeson: The American Othello* (published by World Publishing Company in 1967), writing about Robeson's wife, Eslanda, implies that Robeson's pro-Communist stance was directly traceable to her influence: "She was an intellectual Communist by 1939, whatever she might profess in terms of affiliations. She believed deeply in the Soviet Union and its works, and her attitudes had then and would later have influence to a great degree on Paul Robeson's actions." Why

Hoyt focussed attention upon the year 1939 remains a mystery. Long before that time, Robeson's activism on behalf of Communism and Communists was almost without parallel among American Negroes.

In 1934, Robeson made the first of many visits to the Soviet Union. So enraptured did he become with the Communist system that the following year he enrolled his nine-year-old son, Paul Jr., in a Moscow school, where the boy spent the next four years. In 1939, through the intervention of the Soviet Foreign Office, the youngster began a two-year enrollment at the Soviet embassy's school in London. (In 1960, Paul Jr. would plead the Fifth Amendment when asked by the House Committee on Un-American Activities about his present or past membership in the Communist Party.)

During the 1930's Robeson traveled widely throughout Europe and made several visits to the Soviet Union. He became acquainted with leaders in the Soviet Union and also with others on the international Communist scene, including Jawaharlal Nehru, Kwame Nkrumah, and Jomo Kenyatta, who would later become leaders of India, Ghana, and Kenya, respectively. In 1938, he visited and entertained members of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the American Communists who were fighting for the "Loyalists" in the Spanish Civil War. And as early as 1936, writing in the Communists' monthly *Soviet Russia Today,* he said: "Now, the Soviet Union is the only country I have ever been in where I have felt completely at ease. I have lived in England and America, and I have almost circled the globe, but for myself, wife, and son, the Soviet Union is our future home. For a while, however, I would not feel right going there to live. By singing its praises wherever I go I think that I can be of the most value to it. It is too easy to go to the Soviet Union, breathe the free air, and live happily ever afterward." (In 1949, writing in the U.S.S.R. *Information Bulletin,* Robeson said: "Moscow is very dear to me and very close to my heart. I want to emphasize that only here, in the Soviet Union, did I feel that I was a real man with a capital 'M.' And now after many years I am here again in Moscow, in the country I love more than any other.")

On July 14, 1949, Manning Johnson, in testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, revealed a great deal about Robeson's activities in the 1930's. Johnson had been in the Communist Party from 1930 until 1940. During the course of the hearings ("Communist Infiltration of Minority Groups"), he was asked if he had met Robeson within the Party. Said Johnson: "I have met Paul Robeson a number of times in the headquarters of the national committee of the Communist Party going to and coming from conferences with Earl Browder, Jack Stachel, and J. Peters. During the time I was a member of the Communist Party, Paul Robeson was a member of the Communist Party. Paul Robeson, to my knowledge, has been a member of the Communist Party for many years. In the Negro commission of the national committee of the Communist Party we were told, under threat of expulsion, never to reveal that Paul Robeson was a member of the Communist Party, because Paul Robeson's assignment was highly confidential and secret. For that reason he was not permitted to attend meetings of the national committee of the Communist Party, or any other than broad, general meetings.

"Paul's assignment was to work among the intellectuals, the professionals, and artists that the party was seeking to penetrate and influence along Communist lines. As long as Paul Robeson's identity with the party was kept secret, so long would his work among these groups be effective and serve the best interests of the party. It was for that reason we were told never to reveal the fact that he was a member of the Communist Party.

"As far as Paul Robeson's membership in the Communist Party, of that I have not one iota of doubt. Not only did we in the party hierarchy know he was a member of the party, but we generally understood he was engaged in certain secret work that was intercontinental in connection with his concert tours.

"Of course, Paul Robeson has, by background and his international connections, developed a complex. You recall the role he played, the [film and stage] role of Emperor Jones. He has delusions of grandeur. He wants to be the Black Stalin among Negroes. The Communist Party is encouraging that desire, because the Communist Party can very effectively use Robeson to further their penetration among Negroes. Because he is a popular and great artist, he can attract to him large groups of people, and at those meetings he can make subtle speeches.

"It is regrettable, indeed, that such a man has sold himself to Moscow. He has enjoyed many of the benefits of this country. In fact, all that he has achieved he has achieved in America, and he has sought to play the role of an exploiter of the injustices and ills of American democracy in the interest of a foreign power. That is my opinion based on my years in the Communist movement and my association with the leaders of the Communist Party." (Seven years later, when Robeson appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, he pleaded the Fifth Amendment when asked whether he knew Manning Johnson, and whether he wished to affirm or to deny Johnson's identification of him as a Communist.)

In 1945, Robeson received the Spingarn Medal from the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1946, he denied present or past membership in the Communist Party in testimony before California's Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. And in 1948, he refused to answer the question, "Are you an American Communist?" when he appeared before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. In that same year, Robeson was a strenuous campaigner for Henry A. Wallace, the Communist Party's choice for the U.S. Presidency. In 1952, he was given the Stalin "Peace" Prize, an award reserved for those who have rendered exceptionally distinguished service to the Soviet Union. (Also in 1952, Robeson was publicly charging that the United States was waging bacteriological warfare in Korea.)

In 1956, appearing before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Robeson pleaded the Fifth Amendment when asked about his Communist Party membership. From 1950 until 1958, his pro-Communist activities prevented him from obtaining a passport, and in 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee included his name on its list of the eighty-two most active and typical sponsors of Communist front organizations. Among Robeson's affiliations have been: the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American League for Peace and Democracy ("Communist front"); the American Labor Party ("Communist political front"); the American Peace Crusade of 1951 ("Communist front"); the American Peace Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); the American Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); Artists' Front to Win the War ("Communist front"); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims ("subversive" – "a Communist Party project"); the China Aid Council ("Communist controlled"); the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder ("Communist"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee for a Boycott against Japanese Aggression ("Communist front"); the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy ("Communist"); the American Continental Congress for Peace ("another phase in the Communist 'peace' campaign, aimed at consolidating anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere"); the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo ("Communist front"); the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"); the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – "a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and 'Soviet culture' "); the Emergency Peace Mobilization ("Communist front"); *Freedom* ("Communist publication"); *Friday* ("Communist controlled" publication); the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the Independent Progressive Party ("Communist front"); International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); International Workers Order ("subversive and Communist"); the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); *Masses and Mainstream* ("a Communist magazine"); the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy ("subversive and un-American"); the National Citizens Political Action Committee ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Win the Peace ("subversive and Communist"); the National Conference on American Policy in China and the Far East ("Communist"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the National Labor Conference for Peace ("Communist front"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); *New Masses* ("Communist periodical"); the New Theater League ("Communist front"); People's Songs, Inc. ("subversive"); Progressive Citizens of America ("subversive" – "Communist front"); World Peace Congress ("Communist front"); the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee ("Communist front"); the Southern Conference for Human Welfare ("Communist front"); *Soviet Russia Today* ("Communist front publication"); the Spanish Refugee Appeal ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist"); the Voice of Freedom Committee ("subversive"); the Washington Committee for Aid to China ("Communist-controlled"); and the George Washington Carver School of New York City ("an adjunct of the Communist Party").

Robeson campaigned for Communists, petitioned on behalf of the Communist Party and imprisoned Communists, attended various celebrations for the Communist Party and individual Communists, entertained at Communist gatherings, and participated in the Communists' May Day Parades. In 1958, his birthday was celebrated by the Communist Party in the Soviet Union and in Red China.

From 1958 until 1963, Robeson made his residence in England. While there he performed in concerts throughout Europe and even found time to travel to the Soviet Union. In 1961, however, he fell ill and ended his active entertainment career. The next year, in 1962, he applied for and obtained renewal of his passport, submitting an affidavit stating that he had never been a member of the Communist Party. (The affidavit was required by provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1961.) In 1963, after spending four months in an East Berlin hospital, Robeson returned to the United States.

Two years after he returned to this country, Robeson was interviewed by Jack Smith of the *Los Angeles Times.* Robeson said that he considered the United States to be his home: "I expect to stay and do whatever I can do in the civil rights struggle. Civil rights has been a part of my life. I feel like I was born with it." Robeson denied that he left this country in bitterness: "Just the opposite. I felt triumphant. I had won my passport. I felt that McCarthyism, all that, was a small part of America, as far as I could see." The *Times'* headline writer gushed: "Robeson Cherishes His U.S. Heritage."

OETJE JOHN ROGGE was born on October 12, 1903 in Cass County, Illinois, son of Lydia Satorius and Hermann Rogge. His first wife was Nellie Luther. He is married to Wanda Johnston. He is an alumnus of the University of Illinois (A.B., 1922) and Harvard University (LL.B., 1925; S.J.D., 1931). From 1925 until 1937, he had a private law practice in Chicago.

From 1934 until 1937, Rogge was a counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. From 1937 to 1939, he was, successively, a special counsel and assistant general counsel for the Securities and Exchange Commission. From 1939 until 1946, he was with the Department of Justice as an assistant attorney general in charge of the criminal division (1939-1940) and as a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States (1943-1946). Since 1946, he has resumed private practice. He is the author of *Our Vanishing Civil Liberties* (1949), *Why Men Confess* (1959), *The First and The Fifth* (1960), *The Official German Report* (1961), and *Obscenity Litigation: Ten American Jurisprudence Trials* (1965).

In 1944, while with the Department of Justice, Rogge was the prosecutor in the infamous "sedition" trial. In the Communist-coddling atmosphere of the

Roosevelt Administration, Attorney General Francis Biddle decided to persecute and prosecute some thirty alleged seditionists whose attitudes toward some Jews, all Communists, and the United States entry into World War II were interpreted as crimes of anti-Semitism, anti-Communism, and isolationism. Biddle and his henchman, Rogge, were encouraged in their dirty work by the Anti-Defamation League, the Red-lined CIO, the Communist Party, and a host of fellow travelers.

For his part, Rogge concocted a fantasy whereby he charged that the "seditionists" were trying to bring about a Nazi revolution in the United States by conspiring with Nazi officials in Germany. As part of his fantasy, Rogge charged that the "seditionists" would also promote the Nazi revolution by subverting the armed forces of the United States.

The "sedition" trial lasted a little more than seven months and ended in a mistrial; it was never resumed. And about eighteen months after Tom Clark succeeded Biddle as Attorney General, Rogge ended his twelve-year service with the federal government.

Rogge's avid but clumsy efforts to prosecute Americans on trumped-up charges were merely an indication of his leftwing ideological position. Before and after the trial he amassed a startling number of close associations with the left.

Rogge was affiliated with the American Labor Party ("Communist political front"); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the International Workers Order ("subversive and Communist"); Progressive Citizens of America ("political Communist front"); the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby"); the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Bill of Rights Congress ("subversive"); and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups").

Rogge attended the World Congress of Intellectuals in Wroclaw (1948), in Paris (1949), and in Warsaw (1950), and the Stockholm World Peace Congress (1950) – meetings that were a part of the Communist "peace" movement.

On March 8, 1950, as a delegate of the World Peace Congress, Rogge became the first American ever allowed to address the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. He regaled his top-level Communist audience with a quotation from Thomas Jefferson and presented his personal plans to reduce armaments and to outlaw the atomic bomb. He called upon Communists and Americans to exploit areas of agreement rather than of disagreement: "The Americans must stop blaming the Communists, and the Russians must stop blaming the capitalist imperialists." (Rogge's egalitarian pairing of Communists and Americans was repeated in a press conference after his speech in the Kremlin when he said: "A Communist should be able to get up in a capitalist country and say Communism is better. A capitalist should be able to say the same thing in a Communist country.")

In his private law practice, Rogge has gravitated leftwards in his search for his clientele, which has included atom spy David Greenglass, Communist Yugoslavia, Frank Coe from Nathan Silvermaster's Soviet espionage cell, Communist labor leader Harold Christoffel, the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"), and the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"). Perhaps such behavior by a former special Assistant to the Attorney General is explained by what Rogge wrote in his *Our Vanishing Civil Liberties* (1949): "The Communist scare is a tremendous hoax behind which looms the threat of the American police state and the third world war."

ROBERT V. ROOSA was born on June 21, 1918 in Marquette, Michigan, son of Ruth Lagerquist and Harvey Roosa. He married Ruth Amende. He is an alumnus of the University of Michigan (A.B., 1939; M.A., 1940; Ph.D., 1942). In 1939, he was a Rhodes scholar at Magdalen College, Oxford University. He is the author of *Federal Reserve Operations in the Money and Government Securities Market* (1956); *Monetary Reform for the World Economy* (1965); and *The Dollar and World Liquidity* (1967).

From 1946 until 1960, Roosa was an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. From 1961 until 1964, he was with the U.S. Department of the Treasury as under secretary for monetary affairs. Since 1965, he has been a partner in Brown Brothers, Harriman and Company. He is a director of American Express Company, Anaconda Company, American Express International Banking Corporation, and Fleming-Suez Limited.

Roosa has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council. He is on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Rockefeller Foundation, a pillar of the Liberal Establishment. He is a member of the leftist-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States. In 1966, he was chairman of a UNAUS panel which recommended membership in the UN for Red China.

WILLIAM M. ROTH was born on September 3, 1916 in San Francisco, son of Lurline Matson and William Roth. He married Joan Osborn. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1939).

In 1947, Roth was associated with Barber Oil Corporation. Since 1948, he has been associated with the Honolulu Oil Corporation. Since 1960, he has been associated with Pacific National Life Assurance Company (chairman of the board, 1960-1963). From 1952 until 1961, he was a vice president and a director of Matson Navigation Company and its subsidiaries. From 1963 until 1969, he was on the White House staff: as a deputy special representative for trade negotiations (1963-1966) and special representative for trade negotiations with ambassadorial rank (1967-1969). In 1969, he became a fellow at Harvard University's Kennedy Center for Government.

Matson has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Committee for Economic Development. He has been a trustee of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton, New Jersey, where a haven has been established for leftist scholars. He has been a director of the socialist-oriented Fund for the Republic, and a founding member and director of the Fund's offshoot, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. He has been an official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle.

JACK P. RUINA was born on August 19, 1923 in Rypin, Poland, son of Nechuma Warshaw and Michael Ruina. He was brought to the United States in 1927 and was naturalized in 1932. He married Edith Elster. He is an alumnus of the City College of New York (B.E.E., 1944) and the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn (M.E.E., 1949; D.E.E., 1951).

From 1948 until 1950, Ruina was a research fellow at the Polytechnic Institute. From 1950 until 1954, he was, successively, an instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor of electrical engineering at Brown University. From 1954 until 1959, he was at the University of Illinois' Coordinated Science Laboratory as: research associate professor (1954-1959); research professor (1959-1963); and professor of electrical engineering (1959-1963). Since 1963, he has been at Massachusetts Institute of Technology as a professor of electrical engineering; since 1966, he has been vice president of MIT's special laboratories, which are major centers of military research and development.

From 1959 until 1963, Ruina was on leave of absence while serving in civilian capacities with the United States government in the Department of Defense: deputy for research (1959-1960) and assistant director for defense research and engineering (1960-1961); director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency (1961-1963). Periodically since 1963, he has served as an advisor or consultant to the Air Force, the Department of Defense, the Department of Transportation, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

From 1964 until 1966, Ruina was president of the Institute for Defense Analyses, a "think factory," financed for the most part by American taxpayers. At about the time Ruina assumed the presidency of the IDA, the organization was achieving great notoriety from publicity concerning two of its studies, Phoenix and Fair, which were the product of the leftist wing of the American scientific community. In their full context, the two studies were pleas that appeasement measures bordering upon surrender become fundamental United States diplomatic and military policies vis-à-vis the Soviet Union.

Ruina, in speeches, testimony, and writings, has demonstrated that his relationship with the Institute for Defense Analyses was quite typical. Perhaps the clearest expression of his views occurred in a speech he delivered to the April 1968 meeting of the American Academy of Sciences ("The Nuclear Arms Race: Diagnosis and Treatment," printed in the leftist *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists,* October 1968). In the speech, Ruina stressed the "nuclear holocaust" view that in recent decades has been so popular in leftwing scientific circles. He seemed anxious to place the blame for the nuclear threat equally upon the United States and the Soviet Union: "Since the end of World War II, the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in discussions on the control of nuclear weapons and strategic forces. From the beginning, we realized that traditional national and military thinking would, if unaltered, drive us to the brink of total destruction. Despite this fear, the United States remained distrustful of any accommodation with the Soviet

Union in this area; we found comfort in 'nuclear superiority' while the Soviet Union did not appear to be either serious or reasonable in most of its proposals." [Ruina never did define "traditional national and military thinking" or how such thinking was leading to calamity.] He saw hope, however, in disarmament talks and treaties with the Soviet Union. He refused to acknowledge that such talks and treaties were not sacrosanct in the eyes of Kremlin leaders: "Since the beginning of the arms race, the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in a continuing dialogue – secret government talks, Pugwash meetings, etc. The United States has always wanted to take small steps with adequate inspection controls at each level. On the other hand, the Soviet Union has consistently advocated general and complete disarmament to be followed by inspection. As suspicion grew, the dialogue faltered, and discussions between the United States and the Soviet Union became interspersed monologues. Within the last year, however, there has been some evidence of a merging of views of possible first steps. For instance, it is surprisingly [!] the Russians who are worried about the inspection clause."

Ruina was convinced that superiority in nuclear weapons no longer had meaning, and that it behooved the Congress, the American public, and the American press to "accept the fact." He argued "the cost is excessive, the potential damage tremendous, and the commitment to superiority dangerous and unhealthy given the other serious problems we face." He recognized "the rigid internal secrecy of the Soviet Union," which had to be abandoned so that American and Russian leaders could reach an agreement to reduce their respective striking forces to a minimal level. Basic to his posture was that he understood the diplomatic and military implications of disarmament better than diplomats or military leaders. He had the usual liberal's distrust of the military, but he did concede that the conspiratorial view of the military-industrial complex, although having some validity, was greatly exaggerated. [In 1969, when MIT's authorities were re-examining the relationship between MIT's research and development centers (Instrumentation Laboratory and Lincoln Laboratory) and the Department of Defense, Ruina was fearful that if MIT and other universities abandoned their secret military research contracts, "the country would be left in the hands of the professional military and industrial group."]

Ruina held that Soviet leaders should be trusted by Americans, and that they would be if only Americans appreciated the Soviets as defensive-minded, not inclined to be aggressive.

In 1969, Ruina participated in a Pugwash Conference, a meeting of American scientists with Soviet scientists and government officials. These Conferences, which began in 1957, have never produced a single constructive result for the United States, but have created the impression that Soviet scientists are as free to enter into "informal" discussion as are their American counterparts. The major danger of such meetings, of course, is that in an informal and sociable atmosphere the Americans might reasonably be influenced to divulge information that could weaken our nation's security.

ROBERT RYAN was born on November 11, 1913 in Chicago, son of Mabel Bushnell and Timothy Ryan. He married Jessica Cadwalader. He is an alumnus of Dartmouth College (A.B., 1932).

Ryan has pursued an acting career since the 1930's. He has appeared in summer stock, on the Broadway stage, in motion pictures, and on television. From 1942 until 1945, he served in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Since at least 1959, Ryan has been affiliated with the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been affiliated with the leftwing-globalist United World Federalists. He was a member of the Committee for the First Amendment ("Communist front") and was affiliated with the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"). He is a sponsor of the National Council to Repeal the Draft, which has as its theme: "The draft has effectively abolished the freedom of American men between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six." In politics, he has been active in Democratic campaigns, but in 1968, he concentrated on helping anti-Lyndon Johnson peacenik Democrats, whose opposition to the war in Vietnam followed the ultra-liberal line.

IRVING SALOMON was born on August 23, 1897 in Chicago, son of Ella Polachek and Abraham Salomon. He married Cecile Liebowitz. He attended Northwestern University. He is the author of *Retire and Be Happy* (1951) and *Management Surveys in Colleges and Universities* (1955).

Salomon has had a lifetime of association with a variety of business firms. He has been chairman of the board of the Royal Metal Manufacturing Company of Chicago, the Royal Metal Manufacturing Company of Canada, and the DeLuxe Metal Furniture Company. He has been president of Mount Palomar Ranchos and Gold Coast Productions. He has been a board member of the Coates Board and Carton Company, Diversified Investments Inc., the Union Bank of San Diego, del Mar Associates Inc., and the San Diego Computing Centre.

Away from the business world, Salomon has displayed a strong predilection for liberal-leftist-internationalist-pacifist associations. He has been especially attracted to the United Nations. He has been a delegate to the UN General Assembly, a delegate to the Economic and Social Council of the UN, and chairman of the United States delegation to the 1953 UNESCO conference, and he has worked for the UN's Special Fund. He has been an official of the United Nations Association of the United States, the San Diego United Nations Association, and the United States Committee for UNICEF. He has been associated with the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation, its fund for adult education, and its fund for the advancement of education. He represented the Ford Foundation at the 1951 UNESCO conference. He has been president of the World Affairs Council of San Diego. He has been a board member of the Institute of International Education and the Institute for International Order. He has been a long-time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a board member of the Foreign Policy Association. He has been on the advisory council of the leftist-internationalist World Affairs Center for the United States. He was a founding member of the socialist-oriented Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

FRANCIS B. SAYRE JR. was born on January 17, 1915 in Washington, D.C., son of Jessie Wilson and Francis Sayre. He married Harriet Hart. He is an alumnus of Williams College (A.B., 1937) and the Episcopal Theological School (B.D., 1940). In 1940, he was ordained to the ministry of the Episcopal Church.

From 1940 until 1942, Sayre was an assistant minister at Christ Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts. From 1942 until 1946, he was a chaplain in the U.S. Navy. From 1946 until 1951, he was an industrial chaplain in the Episcopal Diocese of Ohio. From 1947 until 1951, he was rector of St. Paul's Church in East Cleveland. Since 1951, he has been dean of the National Cathedral in Washington, D.C. He has been active in the leftist National Council of Churches.

From 1961 until 1968, Sayre was a member of the statist President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. He has been a sponsor of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council of the United States. He has been a member of the leftist-internationalist Washington (D.C.) Institute of Foreign Affairs. He has been on the advisory council of the leftist-internationalist United States Committee for the United Nations.

DORE SCHARY was born on August 31, 1905 in Newark, New Jersey, son of Belle Drachler and Herman Schary. He married Miriam Svet. He has received several honorary degrees.

In 1926, Schary began his life-long career in the theatre. He has been an actor, screen playwright, stage playwright, and producer. In the film industry, he was employed by Columbia, Paramount, Warner Brothers, Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, David O. Selznick, and RKO. From 1948 until 1956, he was executive vice president in charge of production and studio operations at M-G-M. Since 1956, he has been an independent producer and playwright.

On October 29, 1947, Schary appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He testified, under oath: "I am not a Communist. I have never been a Communist. I never contemplated becoming a Communist, and I am opposed to Communists. I have fought the Communist line at any time that I have seen it become apparent."

The public records of the California Legislature's Un-American Activities Committee carry Schary's name as having been affiliated with American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Hollywood Writers Mobilization ("subversive and Communist"); and the Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("Communist front").

Schary has sponsored the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, and the leftwing-pacifist Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. He was a member of the advisory committee of the leftwing-globalist U.S. Committee for the United Nations. He has been on the advisory council of the leftwing-globalist International Movement for Atlantic Union. He has been on the national board of the leftwing-globalist United World Federalists. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. He has been on the national board of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. He has been a sponsor of Franklin Littell's Institute for American Democracy, an offshoot of the defamatory anti-anti-Communist Anti-Defamation League. (From 1963 until 1969, Schary was national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League, and since 1969 he has been honorary chairman.)

Schary has been active in Democratic Party campaigns. During the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson Administrations, he served on various committees on farm labor, handicapped persons, poverty, and immigration reform. In February 1970, Mayor John Lindsay appointed Schary to be New York City's first Commissioner of Cultural Affairs.

ADOLPH W. SCHMIDT was born on September 13, 1904 in McKeesport, Pennsylvania, son of Louise and Adolph Schmidt. He married Helen Mellon. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1926) and Harvard University (M.B.A., 1929). He also pursued graduate studies at the University of Dijon, the University of Berlin, and the University of Paris.

From 1929 until 1938, Schmidt was in the banking business in Pennsylvania at the Mellon National Bank, the Forbes National Bank, and the Union Trust Company. From 1938 until 1942, he was engaged in trust management. From 1939 until 1942, he was chairman of the board of Columbia Radiator Company. From 1940 until 1944, he was a director and on the executive committee of the Pittsburgh Coal Company. Since 1946, he has been a vice president of T. Mellon and Sons. From 1954 until 1965, he was president of the Andrew Mellon Educational and Charitable Trust.

In 1969, Schmidt became United States Ambassador to Canada.

Schmidt has been a long-time nonresident member of the Council of Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is an activist in Clarence Streit's complex of leftist-one world organizations: the International Movement for Atlantic Union, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the Atlantic Council of the United States.

FRANZ H. SCHURMANN was born on June 21, 1926 in New York City, son of Martha Kircheis and Franz Schurmann. He married Isadora Ding. He is an alumnus of Trinity College (B.A., 1946) and Harvard University (Ph.D., 1950). He is the author of *Ideology and Organization in Communist China* (1966), a tribute to the regime of Mao Tse-tung based extensively on Red Chinese propaganda. (As early as 1962, Schurmann was an apologist for Red China.)

Since 1957, Schurmann has been at the University of California in Berkeley. He began as a lecturer in sociology and Near Eastern Languages. Since 1965, he has been a professor of sociology and history. Since 1964, he has been chairman of the Center for Chinese Studies. (In 1965, Schurmann had in his employ at the Center one of the earliest State Department members of the Red China lobby, John Stewart Service.)

At Berkeley, Schurmann has had a long history of supporting campus and community radicals. In 1960, he petitioned California's Attorney General to investigate "police brutality" during the Communist-directed riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In 1965, Schurmann became one of the most prominent individuals on the Berkeley campus when he emerged as one of the most virulent critics of U.S. participation in the Vietnam War. He affiliated with various peacenik groups, including the Faculty Peace Committee and the Viet Nam Day Committee. He portrayed the United States as an imperialistic aggressor in Vietnam. He glorified the Viet Cong. He called for immediate and unconditional cessation of U.S. bombing in North Vietnam. He became widely and favorably quoted in major Communist Party publications. He appeared on the roster of lecturers at the Socialist Caucus series at Stanford University and the San Francisco New School, operated by the ultra-leftist Students for a Democratic Society. He associated openly with notorious Communists. He campaigned for Robert Scheer, an ultra-radical candidate for Congress. And in 1967 and 1968, he supported the Communist-dominated Peace and Freedom Party.

BOBBY SEALE was born on October 22, 1936 in Dallas, Texas. After four years in the U.S. Air Force, he received a bad conduct discharge in 1958. After his service years, he worked from time to time as a sheet-metal mechanic. From 1959 until 1962, he was a part-time student at Merritt Junior College in West Oakland, California.

While at Merritt in 1961, Seale was a member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In the same year, he met Huey Newton, an accomplished racial agitator, who recruited him into the Afro-American Association.

In 1965, Seale and Newton became disenchanted with the Afro-American Association. They considered the A-AA to be less radical and less activist than they deemed necessary for the promotion of Negroes' interests. At the time of their resignation, the A-AA was associated with the Revolutionary Action Movement, which enjoyed very sympathetic contacts with the régimes in Communist China and Communist Cuba.

In 1965, Seale worked in a government-financed anti-poverty program. He alleges that he was fired because he was teaching youngsters "Black History." In 1966, he was foreman in a summertime youth work program, operating under the auspices of the government-financed North Oakland Neighborhood Anti-Poverty Center. He was paid $660 a month for what was essentially a job as tutor in racial agitation.

In 1966, Seale and Newton founded and became the top leaders of the Black Panther Party. They attracted to their new organization some of the most notorious racial agitators in the country including: H. Rap Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Eldridge Cleaver, and James Forman. They presented their Black Panther Party to the public as a legitimate political party, and for the guidance of their partisans they produced a Political Education Kit, in which they proclaimed: "We must . . . teach party members to apply the Marxist-Leninist method in analyzing a political situation."

Seale and Newton drafted the revolutionary aims of the Black Panthers, which included: the release of all blacks from all jails throughout the country; trials of all blacks to be held before all-black juries; exemption from all military service for all blacks; "education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society"; and "a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate, for the purpose of determining the will of black people as well as their national destiny." (Seale later said: "I view black people in America as a colonial people. Therefore we have to arm ourselves and make the colonial power give us our freedom.")

In 1967, the Black Panthers achieved their first nation-wide notoriety when Seale led them on an armed invasion of the California State Legislature. As a result of this terroristic escapade, Seale spent five months in jail. But, more important, he became a national celebrity, and on August 6, 1967, was the featured subject of an article by Sol Stern in the *New York Times* magazine.

In the Stern article, it became quite evident that Seale and the Black Panthers, behind the façade of a political party, were organizing as revolutionaries to wage guerrilla warfare against all police – "pigs," in the lexicon of the Black Panthers. The police, from the perspective of Seale and the Panthers, are the symbols of law and order, which is translated by Seale to mean "repression" and "colonialism." Stern, in his research for the *Times* article, found Seale saying: "All right brothers, let's understand what we want. We have to change our tactics. Black people can't just mass on the streets and riot. They'll just shoot us down." Instead, it is necessary to organize in small groups to "take care of business." The "business" includes, among other things, "executing racist cops." Graphically, Seale describes how a couple of bloods can surprise cops on their coffee break. The Negroes march up to the cop and then "they shoot him down – voom, voom – with a 12-gauge shotgun." That, says Seale, would be an example of "righteous power." (The inflammatory quotations from Seale that Stern used were not isolated. On other occasions Seale said: "We aren't hungry for violence; we don't want violence. Violence is ugly, guns are ugly. But we understand that there are two kinds of violence: the violence that is perpetrated against our people by the Fascist aggression of the power structure; and self-defense – a form of violence used to defend ourselves from the unjust violence that's inflicted upon us." – "The only way that the world is ever going to be free is when the youth of this country *moves* with every principle of human respect and with every soft spot we have in our hearts for human life, in a fashion that lets the pig power structure know that when people are racistly and Fascistically attacked, the youth will put a foot in their butts and make their blood chill." – "We [blacks] have potential destructive power. Look around at those factories down there. If we don't get what we want, we can make it impossible for the [white] man's system to function. All we got to do is drop some [Molotov] cocktails into those oil tanks and then watch everything go." – In 1968, at a rally in San Francisco, Seale warned his audience of "black brothers and sisters to go home and arm themselves . . . the racist power structure must be disarmed, or it will have to face the wrath of the armed black people.")

In 1968, during the proceedings of the Democratic National Convention in Chicago, Seale was a prominent participant in the riotous demonstrations that took place on the streets and in the parks. (In his summary of the Chicago demonstrations, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover said: "Demonstrations held during the convention period included taunting of the police: they were referred to as 'pigs,' they were spat upon, obscenities were shouted at them and they were the targets of all kinds of unbelievable abuse; on several occasions undisciplined mobs intent on marching to the convention site without legal authority had to be repulsed by the police and National Guard. Reportedly many of the hippies used drugs regularly.

"The demonstrations resulted in mass arrests. Also, there were numerous police and demonstrators injured. Approximately 650 arrests were made by local authorities and nearly 200 police officers were injured during the confrontations with the demonstrators. It has been estimated that more than 900 persons obtained emergency treatment for injuries received during the disorder."

On March 20, 1969, Seale and seven of his cohorts were indicted by a federal grand jury at Chicago. Among the counts charged against Seale was "that during the period beginning on or about July 20, 1968 through on or about August 22, 1968, Bobby Seale . . . did travel in interstate commerce from outside the State of Illinois to Chicago, Illinois . . . with intent to incite, organize, promote and encourage a riot and, thereafter, on or about August 28, 1968, at Grant Park, Chicago, Illinois, he did speak to an assemblage of persons for the purpose of inciting, organizing, promoting and encouraging a riot."

Seale and his co-defendants decided to call themselves "The Conspiracy," and invited others "to join a conspiracy of people against the forces that brought us Vietnam, the ABM, racism, high taxes, unemployment, hunger, political machines and a corporate system that exalts private profit and property over human needs." (A "Committee to Defend the Conspiracy" was immediately formed to solicit political and financial support for Seale and his co-defendants. Rallying for "The Conspiracy" were the usual letterhead performers, along with some newcomers: Leonard Bernstein, Julian Bond, Noam Chomsky, Congressmen John Conyers Jr. and Don Edwards, Judy Collins, Harvey Cox, Ossie Davis and his wife Ruby Dee, Jules Feiffer, Allen Ginsberg, Michael Harrington, Nat Hentoff, John Hersey, Sidney Lens, Helen Lynd, Dwight MacDonald, Norman Mailer, Stewart Meacham, Marcus Raskin, Pete Seeger, Tom Smothers, Benjamin Spock, I.F. Stone, Albert Szent-Györgyi, Harold Taylor, Arthur Waskow, and Howard Zinn.)

The trial of "The Conspiracy" began on September 24, 1969, in the federal district court of Chicago. Seale had as his attorney Charles Garry, a veteran defender of Communists and other radicals. When Garry was forced to enter a hospital for an operation, Seale insisted that his trial be postponed. The presiding justice, Julius Hoffman, refused Seale's request and also denied Seale permission to serve as his own attorney. Seale and his co-defendants proceeded to disrupt the entire decorum of the trial with physical demonstrations, especially with abusive shouts directed at Judge Hoffman. (Seale's special epithets for the Judge were: "You Fascist dog!" and "You Fascist pig!")

In an effort to bring some semblance of order to the trial, Judge Hoffman had Seale bound and gagged in the courtroom. But when Seale, despite the restraints, would not remain quiet, Judge Hoffman declared a mistrial for Seale, while the trial of the other seven defendants continued. For his rampageous behavior, Seale was found guilty on sixteen counts of contempt and sentenced to four years' imprisonment – but he was released on bail after appealing the sentence.

In January 1970, Seale returned to the Chicago trial as a witness for the seven co-defendants. He identified himself as "chairman of the Black Panther Party, community organizer, comedian, musician, drummer, architectural draftsman and general machine operator." The defense introduced the tape of a speech Seale delivered in Chicago's Lincoln Park during the time the Democratic National Convention was in session. The prosecution then questioned Seale about certain passages in the speech: "I'm saying that we have a right to defend ourselves as human beings, and if some pig comes up to us unjustly, then we have to bring our pieces and start barbecuing some of that pork." – "Get every black man in the black community with a shotgun in his home, and a .357 Magnum and a .45 if he can get it, and an M-1 if he can get and everything else if he can get it." – ". . . When black people start topping a few of the spikes that hold them, that hold the chain around their arms . . . pick up a crowbar. Pick up a piece. Pick up a gun. And pull that spike out from the wall. Because if you pull it on out, and if you shoot well, all I'm gonna do is pat you on the back and say, 'Keep on shooting.' " – "Stop running in large groups . . . we should run in groups of four and fives . . . small groups using revolutionary tactics, so we can dissemble those pigs, who occupy our community."

The prosecution asked Seale if the excerpts from his speech were not indications that Seale wanted blacks to shoot policemen. Seale denied any such intention and insisted that he simply offered advice for "self-defense against brutal, unprovoked attack." The prosecution then questioned Seale about another speech he made in Chicago, in which he said: "If the police get in the way of our march, tangle with the blue-helmeted [obscenity] and kill them and send them to the morgue slab." When asked to explain this statement, Seale – on the advice of counsel – pleaded the Fifth Amendment. (The trial of Seale's co-defendants was concluded on February 18, 1970. But for various reasons, in the fall of 1970, his trial had yet to begin.)

After the 1968 Chicago demonstrations, Seale continued his revolutionary activities. In November and December 1968, when the Communist-saturated Hemispheric Conference to End the War in Viet Nam was held in Montreal, Seale was on the scene. Despite the presence of Communist activists from around the world, Seale and the Black Panthers assumed charge of the conference and, in an attention-getting gesture, donated money collected by the Black Panthers to the Viet Cong.

In 1969, Seale cemented relations with the Far Left by forming a coalition between the Black Panthers and the Communist-saturated Peace and Freedom Party. He also organized the United Front against Fascism, a merger of black militants and white revolutionaries. (By 1970, Seale was repeatedly disavowing "black pigs," "black racists," and "[black] cultural nationalists," and tried to convince anyone who would listen that he wanted to work with "oppressed peoples" of all kinds. His protestations of non-racism evidently impressed Raymond A. Sokolov of *Time* magazine who wrote [June 15, 1970]: "Sympathetic and fair-minded, yes, but Seale remains a revolutionary willing to confront the ugliness of what he believes he may have to do. Even in a single sentence, he sometimes combines an ethic of love and forbearance with startling and awful prospects of mayhem . . . a typical mixture of humanity and crude force.")

In August 1969, Seale was indicted in the federal district court of New Haven, Connecticut, on charges of murder, kidnapping, conspiracy to murder, and conspiracy to kidnap Alex Rackley, a Black Panther who was suspected by the Panthers of being a police informant. Twelve Panthers were indicted for the crime and among them was George Sams Jr., who pleaded guilty to second-degree murder.

(Three other Panthers pleaded guilty to various charges associated with Sams' murder.) Sams testified that Seale, after giving a lecture at Yale University, visited the New Haven headquarters of the Panthers and ordered Sams to kill Rackley.

From August 1969 until March 1970, Seale fought extradition from California to Connecticut. In the meantime, his Panthers and outside sympathizers conducted periodic demonstrations in New Haven with the theme "Free Bobby Seale." As in the case of his Chicago trial, in the fall of 1970, Seale had yet to be tried in New Haven.

In the summer of 1970, while under indictments in Chicago and New Haven, a book by Seale, *Seize the Time: The Story of the Black Panther Party and Huey P. Newton,* was published by Random House. The book was reviewed in most of the nation's major publications – both magazines and newspapers. The publisher remarked that the book derived "from tape recordings made by Bobby Seale in the early fall of 1968 and the fall and winter of 1969-1970."

Christopher Lehmann-Haupt, who reviewed Seale's book in the *New York Times* (June 17, 1970), seemed undecided as to how he should respond to *Seize The Time*: "Frivolously? All right: it is badly written . . . . Or does one treat his book as a fund-raising love letter to guilty white liberals? O.K. He convinces us that the Panthers have been misrepresented and misused by the white Establishment, that Huey P. Newton is a genuine hero. But if he is at such pains to clean up the Panther image – to persuade us that the Panthers are into class warfare, not race warfare; that they loathe cultural nationalists like LeRoi Jones and Ron Karenga; that they are concerned with defense and not offense; and that his own intentions were not to disrupt Judge Julius Hoffman's court, but to demand his constitutional rights; then why does he not once bring up the anti-Zionist poetry that appeared in the Panther newspaper, or [Eldridge] Cleaver's advocacy of guerrilla-training with the Al Fatah? Or one can walk the existential tightrope. Let's accept Mr. Seale's conceit of the American head severed from its body. Let's buy for a moment his images of puritanical, sexless, comic-book-reading white American brains fatally at odds with pagan, procreative, funky black bodies. Assume that he's right when he says you can't sit around theorizing. And believe him when he contends that where the Panthers are really at is in what they're trying to do – feeding breakfasts to poor children, drumming up free medicine and free medical care, registering voters, setting up liberation schools and pushing for community control of police (not Establishment review boards). Well and good, if it all works out."

Lehmann-Haupt came somewhat down to earth when he concluded his review of Seale's *Seize the Time* by writing: "But the inescapable fact remains that Bobby Seale has written a book, and, by definition, that is a cerebral, abstract undertaking – headwork. And it's filled with revolutionary cant, with echoes of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist dogma, and, worst of all, the sort of sloganeering prose that brutalizes individual consciousness just as badly as 400 years of American history has brutalized the blacks."

What Lehmann-Haupt failed to admit and/or recognize about Seale's book was that it was permeated with obscenities – few paragraphs escaped his selected favorites – directed against the United States, whites, all policemen, all law enforcement authorities, and all blacks who were unwilling to follow his revolution-for-the-sake-of-revolution. Armed violence by blacks, especially against police, was Seale's recurring exhortation throughout the book. His other main theme concerned blacks against whites. But of course Seale denied that his Panthers waged racial warfare, said it was merely class warfare, and even then insisted that the Panthers were on the defensive, not the offensive, side of the battle.

Wallace Terry reported the results of an interview with Seale in *Time* magazine (April 6, 1970). Terry found that Seale sought "an interracial revolution that would create a Marxist-styled socialistic form of government in the U.S. He is convinced that blacks can never achieve their rights under the present system." Terry asked Seale: "Where does the black American go from here in his drive for a racially equal society?" Seale answered: "Black people, brothers and sisters in this country, have to move to a level of revolutionary struggle in terms of what we understand to be the true enemy, the enemy who perpetuates tyranny and oppression, poverty and the wretched conditions that we're subjected to in the black community. This enemy, as Eldridge [Cleaver] always puts it, is at three levels of oppression: the big-time, tycooning, avaricious businessmen, the lying, demagogic, tricky politicians, and the fascist pig cops, militia, and pig agents who work for the avaricious, demagogic ruling class. Black people's direction should be to wage a relentless revolutionary struggle against the three levels of oppression. But it can't be handled alone by blacks. We need alliances with those whose own self-interest is to seek communities free of disorders."

Terry asked: "What do you think will happen in the next decade to the black drive for a racially equal society?" Seale replied: "First, you have no pat blueprint for revolution. Second, I see the power structure moving into a fascist state, George Orwell's *1984,* where they say, 'Big Brother is watching you.' They will move to take away constitutional rights, not only from black people but, as we can see with the Chicago Seven, from white people too. And at the same time, I see a lot of black, white, red and brown people becoming politically educated and moving to oppose the fascist regime that's being built."

Terry: "What are your recommendations for achieving black goals in the next ten years?" Seale: "When we speak of what is to be accomplished, we have to deal with an understanding that the political, economic and social injustices that exist have to be solved with some practical program. The Panther party's free-breakfast program for children and its attack on hunger are related to where we're going. There are 15 million people in this country who are hungry, and 50% of them are black, and when you move in this fashion, you start taking care of the children, because they will have to sustain the struggle.

"What it's going to entail, though, is black people institutionalizing such programs in the community, where they have control over them. Even the poor white people have to oppose the system with these kinds of programs. It's a need for cooperative housing, cooperative marketing, more unity with the workers. The workers are going to have to start demanding a 30-hour work week with the same 40-hour pay. The poor oppressed are predominantly white unemployed. The courts have to be controlled more by the people, and the constitutional rights of the people are going to have to be secured."

Terry: "Is a second civil war, or a race war between blacks and whites in America, a possibility or an inevitability?" Seale: "I don't think there's going to be a race war. Here in the streets, we can see that young middle-class people are opposing the Establishment in the manner that black people have."

Terry: "What is your prescription for ending white racism in America?" Seale: "What you have to do to end white racism is civilize white America. You have to educate the masses of white America to the trick bag that the power structure's putting them into."

Terry: "What value is there in the notion of black nationalism or black separatism?" Seale: "You don't fight racism with racism. The best way to fight racism is with solidarity. When you talk of black separation it is not a point of whether we dig black separation. The fact of the matter is that now we are already separated. So we're not concerned with abstract, false notions of integration. Nor are we concerned with abstract, false notions of separation. We are concerned with the political, economic and social evils."

EUSTACE SELIGMAN was born on April 1, 1889 in New York City, son of Caroline Beer and Edwin Seligman. He married Maud Jaretzki. He is an alumnus of Amherst College (A.B., 1910) and Columbia University (LL.B., 1914), and studied law also at Harvard University, the University of Paris, and the University of Berlin.

Since 1914, Seligman has been associated with the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell, notable for two famous members, John Foster Dulles and Allen Dulles.

Seligman was one of the first Red China lobbyists in the United States. Writing in his "The U.S. Should Change Its China Policy" (a 1958 pamphlet of the Foreign Policy Association's *Headline Series*), he advanced the two-China policy that has become so popular in liberal circles: "We would propose to withdraw our opposition to the recognition of the UN of the Communist government as the government of China on three conditions: First, Taiwan (Formosa) should be recognized as a separate nation and admitted to the UN. Its security should be guaranteed by the major nations against external aggression or subversion, and it should be subject to an agreement that within a reasonable number of years a UN plebiscite should be held under which the inhabitants would be given the right to decide if Taiwan should continue as an independent nation or join China. Second, a peace treaty should be concluded providing for the unification of Korea as heretofore proposed by the UN, that country to be demilitarized and with its security also guaranteed against external aggression or subversion. Third, all Americans wrongfully held in China should be released." (Why American captives had to be pawns in such dubious negotiations was not explained by Seligman.)

In the *Amherst Alumni News* (Summer 1964), Seligman's promotion of UN membership for Red China followed the two-wrongs-make-a-right tack: "Since we will therefore have to live in the same world with Communist China, it would be preferable for us if Communist China were in the United Nations rather than out. It is, of course, true that Article 4 of the Charter limits membership to peace-loving states and that unquestionably Communist China does not qualify as such. However, the admission to the United Nations of various Soviet satellites amounted to a tacit repudiation of any membership qualifications and the recognition, instead, of the desirability of including as members all the nations of the world in order thereby to reduce the risk of war between them."

In 1958 and 1959, Seligman was chairman of the board of the Foreign Policy Association. The guiding genius of the FPA, at that time, was Vera Micheles Dean who, since 1931, had been instrumental in making the FPA and its publications one of the most effective and influential pro-Communist vehicles in the United States. Seligman did nothing to rectify the situation created by Dean, and, as a matter of fact, has remained a member of the FPA's national council and a member of its board of directors.

Seligman's leftwing activities have not been confined to the FPA. He has been affiliated with the American Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief ("subversive and Communist"); the Council on Foreign Relations (the informal supra-State Department of the United States); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility (an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.)

CLARENCE SENIOR was born on June 9, 1903 in Clinton, Missouri, son of Maggie Ollson and Joseph Senior. He married Ruth Miller. He is an alumnus of the University of Kansas (A.B.,1927), the University of Kansas City in Missouri (A.M., 1941), and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1955). He also pursued graduate studies at the University of Vienna and the Internationalische Volkshochschule in Denmark. He is the author of *The Puerto Rican Migrant in St. Croix* (1946); *Puerto Rican Emigration* (1947); *The Puerto Rican in New York City* (1948); *Strangers and Neighbors* (1952); *Land Reform and Democracy* (1958); *The Puerto Ricans* (1965); and *Our Citizens from the Caribbean* (1965). He is the co-author of *The Puerto Rican Journey* (1950); *One America* (1951); *Understanding Minority Groups* (1956); *Jamaican Migration to Great Britain* (1956); *The Caribbean: Its Economy* (1955); *In a Strange Land* (1961); *The School Dropout* (1964); *Imperatives in Education* (1965); *The Assault on Poverty* (1966); and *The Status of Puerto Rico* (1966).

From 1927 until 1929, Senior worked for the Adult Education Association of Cleveland and the Cleveland Labor College. From 1929 until 1936, he was the national executive secretary of the Socialist Party of the United States. In 1937, he was the labor editor of the *Milwaukee Leader.* From 1938 until 1941, he was director of the Information Center of the Americas. From 1940 until 1942, he was director of the Inter-American Institute at the University of Kansas City. In 1942 and 1943, he worked in the Latin American division of the Board of Economic Warfare. In 1943 and 1944, he was a field worker on a regional resources development project on Latin America for the National Planning Association. In 1944 and 1945, he was engaged in research in Latin America for the federal government's Foreign Economic Administration. From 1945 until 1948, he was director of the Social Science Research Center at the University of Puerto Rico, and from 1948 until 1950, was director of a study of Puerto Rican migration to New York at Columbia University. From 1950 until 1960, he was a lecturer in sociology at Columbia University, and since 1961, he has been a professor of sociology at Brooklyn College. Since 1965, he has been director of the Center for Migration Studies at Brooklyn College. Since 1949, he has been a consultant to Puerto Rico's Department of Labor, and from 1951 until 1960, he was chief of the migration division in the Department. From 1961 until 1968, he was a member of the board of education in New York City.

Senior's sociology is of the socialist-egalitarian brand, as evidenced in his writings. For about forty-five years he has been prominently associated with the socialist League for Industrial Democracy. In his collegiate days, he was a leader of the Student League for Industrial Democracy. He has served on the national council and board of directors of the LID, and is a recipient of the LID's John Dewey Award, one of the most coveted tributes in leftist circles.

MARSHALL SHULMAN was born on April 8, 1916 in Jersey City, son of Bessie Waldman and Harry Shulman. He was married to the late Elizabeth Thomson. He is now married to Colette Schwarzenbach. He is an alumnus of the University of Michigan (A.B., 1937) and Columbia University (M.A., 1948; Ph.D., 1959). He also pursued graduate studies at Harvard University. He is the author of *Stalin's Foreign Policy Reappraised* (1963) and *Beyond the Cold War* (1966).

In 1937, 1938, and 1940, Shulman was a reporter for the *Detroit News.* In 1938 and 1939, he was a writer for the National Safety Council. From 1940 until 1942, he was vice president of the Council for Democracy in New York City. From 1942 until 1946, he was in the U.S. Army Air Corps. In 1949 and 1950, he was an information officer for the United States mission to the United Nations. From 1950 until 1953, he was a special assistant to Secretary of State Dean Acheson. From 1954 until 1967, he was at Harvard University's Russian Research Center: as associate director of the Center (1954-1962); lecturer in government (1956-1960); and research associate (1962-1967). From 1961 until 1967, he was a professor of international politics at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Since 1967, he has been a professor of government at, and the director of, Columbia University's Russian Institute.

Shulman has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. In December 1967, Shulman, at the behest of President Joseph E. Johnson of the leftist-Pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, joined such well-known leftists as Harding Bancroft, Ernest Gross, Roger Hilsman, Milton Katz, Adam Yarmolinsky, and Charles Yost in sending a memorandum to President Lyndon Johnson. The memorandum appeared in the *New York Times* on January 17, 1968. The signatories had held a meeting in Bermuda in December under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment. The memorandum contained much hand-wringing over escalation of the U.S. war effort, which it said could result in an invasion of North Vietnam and possibly cause the Soviet Union and Red China to intervene directly on the side of

North Vietnam. The United States was urged to shift its strategy from "search-and-destroy" to "clear-and-hold" operations. "To shift international pressures from Washington to Hanoi," the United States was advised to cease bombing of North Vietnam. Most important, the memorandum contended that the United States should seek political avenues for negotiations with the National Liberation Front (the memorandum was merely a restatement of leftwing, peacenik arguments that had been bruited about for months prior to the Carnegie Endowment's grab for publicity.)

Harvard's Russian Research Center and Columbia's Russian Institute, Shulman's bases of activity for the past sixteen years, have been active influences for appeasement and accommodation with the Soviet Union. Shulman has described the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union as a "limited adversary relationship." From that premise, he has been a strong advocate of disarmament negotiations and expansion of cultural exchanges. As is the wont of the left-of-center Sovietologists, he holds to the thesis that Soviet leadership has mellowed since the death of Stalin and that the Soviets are genuinely seeking peaceful coexistence. He places great trust in Soviet-American diplomatic negotiations and agreements. In 1966, after a visit to the Soviet Union for "unofficial" discussions on arms control, Shulman was charged in *Izvestia* (October 30, 1966) with being some sort of anti-Soviet intelligence agent. The article was demonstrably an expression of rank ingratitude.

GEORGE SHUSTER was born on August 27, 1894 in Lancaster, Wisconsin, son of Elizabeth Nauman and Anthony Shuster. He married Doris Cunningham. He is an alumnus of the University of Notre Dame (A.B., 1915; M.A. 1920). He also pursued graduate studies at Columbia University (Ph.D., 1940) and the University of Poitiers (France). He is the author of *Catholic Spirit in Modern English Literature* (1922); *Newman: Prose and Poetry* (1925); *English Literature* (1926); *The Hill of Happiness* (1926); *The Catholic Spirit in America* (1927); *The Eternal Magnet* (1929); *The Catholic Church and Current Literature* (1929); *The Germans* (1932); *Strong Man Rules* (1934); *Like a Mighty Army* (1935); *Brother Flo* (1938); *Look Away* (1939); *The English Ode from Milton to Keats* (1940); *Religion and Education* (1945); *Cultural Cooperation and the Peace* (1952); *Religion behind the Iron Curtain* (1954); *In Silence I Speak* (1956); *Education and Moral Wisdom* (1960); *The Ground I Walked On* (1961); *UNESCO* (1963); and *Catholic Education in a Changing World* (1967).

From 1920 until 1924, he was head of the English department at the University of Notre Dame. In 1924 and 1925, he was an English instructor at Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute. From 1924 until 1935, he was an English professor at St. Joseph's College for Women in Brooklyn. From 1925 until 1937, he was with *Commonweal* magazine, as associate editor (1925-1929) and managing editor (1929-1937). From 1937 until 1939, he held a Social Science Research Council fellowship at Columbia University. From 1939 until 1960, he was at Hunter College, as dean and acting president (1939 and 1940), and president (1940-1960). Since 1960, he has been assistant to the president of the University of Notre Dame.

From 1944 until 1947, Shuster was a member of the University of Chicago's

Commission on the Freedom of the Press. (The late Frank Hughes of the *Chicago Tribune* in his monumental *Prejudice and the Press* exposed the nefarious activities of that Commission.) From 1958 until 1964, he was the United States representative on the executive board of UNESCO, which since its inception has attempted to impose Communist standards on the educational processes in every nation in the world.

Shuster has enjoyed a very close relationship with Robert M. Hutchins, the arch-leftist who has been guiding the Ford Foundation and its offshoots since the early 1950's. Hutchins was chairman of the Commission on the Freedom of the Press. He was president of the Fund for the Republic while Shuster was vice chairman of the Fund's board of directors. And he was president of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions while Shuster was vice chairman of the Center's board of directors. Hutchins and Shuster have also spent many years together on the *Encyclopaedia Britannica's* board of editors.

Shuster has been affiliated with the Institute for American Democracy, an anti-anti-Communist witch-hunting offshoot of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. He has been a member of Freedom House's Bookshelf Committee, a group of leftists who selected books by leftists to enlighten "leaders and scholars in Africa, Asia and Latin America." He has been affiliated with the Advertising Council, which uses business firms' moneys to propagandize pet projects of the federal government, as a "public service," on radio and television, in newspapers and magazines, and in commercial advertisements. He was also affiliated with the American Youth Congress ("subversive and Communist"); with the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead of Negro agitation for the past fifty-eight years; with the National Wartime Conference of the Professions, the Sciences, the Arts, the White-Collar Fields ("Communist front"); and with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. For ten years, Shuster was a director of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (leftwing-pacifist).

GERARD C. SMITH was born on May 4, 1914 in New York City, son of Mary Smith and John Smith. He married Bernice Maguire. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1935; LL.B., 1938).

From 1939 until 1941, Smith was in the legal department of the General Motors Corporation in New York City. From 1946 until 1950, he practiced law in New York City. From 1950 until 1954, he was a special assistant to the Atomic Energy Commissioners. From 1954 until 1957, he was a special assistant to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles on atomic, space, and disarmament affairs. From 1957 until 1961, he was an assistant secretary of state and the director of the policy planning staff in the Department of State. From 1961 until 1969, he was a member of the board of consultants in the Policy Planning Council of the Department of State. In the Nixon Administration, he has been the director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the chief of the United States delegation to the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) at Helsinki and Vienna.

Smith has impressive credentials as a highly respected member of the leftist-internationalist Establishment both within and outside of the federal government. Since 1961, he has been associated with the Washington Center for Foreign Policy Research (a branch of the School of Advanced International Studies of The Johns Hopkins University) as a foreign policy consultant, a member of the advisory council, and a research associate. (His associates have included such perennial stalwarts of the ruling establishment as Milton Eisenhower, George McGhee, Douglas Dillon, William C. Foster, Theodore Achilles, Christian A. Herter, Dean Acheson, Charles Bohlen, McGeorge Bundy, Allen Dulles, Livingston Merchant, Paul Nitze, Gordon Gray, Abe Fortas, Eugene Black, and Clark Clifford.)

In 1967, Smith began publishing *Interplay: The Magazine of European/American Developments.* His editorial advisors included such Establishment leftists as George W. Ball, Christian A. Herter Jr., Marshall Shulman, and Arthur Schlesinger Jr. The same ideological quality was to be found in the contributors of articles to *Interplay:* Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Steele Commager, Henry Kissinger, Joseph Kraft, and Walt Rostow. Ecstatic praises rained down on Smith's publishing venture from the left wing: Eugene Rostow, Dean Rusk, John Lindsay, Philip Mosely, David Rockefeller, J. William Fulbright, Chalmers Roberts, Tom Wicker, Stewart Alsop, Arthur Goldberg, and Eugene Black.

Smith is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is on the board of directors of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Council. He is on the national council of the leftist-internationalist Foreign Policy Association.

SUSAN SONTAG was born on January 28, 1933 in New York City. She was married to and divorced from Philip Rieff. She is an alumna of the University of Chicago (B.A., 1951) and Radcliffe College (M.A., 1952). She pursued undergraduate studies at the University of California for one year and graduate studies at the University of Paris. In 1964 and 1965, she was a writer-in-residence at Rutgers University. She held a grant from the American Association of University Women and a Guggenheim fellowship. She taught philosophy at the City College of New York (one year), Sarah Lawrence College (one year), and Columbia University (four years). In 1959, she was an editor of *Commentary* magazine.

Miss Sontag is the author of two novels: *The Benefactor* (1963) and *Death Kit* (1967); two collections of essays: *Against Interpretation* (1966) and *Styles of Radical Will* (1969); and a screenplay: *Duet for Cannibals* (1969). She has contributed articles to *Partisan Review, Ramparts, Nation, Commentary, New York Review of Books, Columbia Spectator, Esquire,* and *Evergreen Review.*

In 1968, Miss Sontag received and accepted an invitation to visit Hanoi. She made the trip with two prominent leftists, Andrew Kopkind and Robert Greenblatt. She memorialized the trip with an article in the December 1968 issue of *Esquire.* (The article was reproduced as a paperback book and also appeared in a volume of her essays.)

By 1968, Miss Sontag was well known as an activist in various leftwing anti-Vietnam War groups ("I have been and am passionately opposed to the American aggression in Vietnam."). In her *Esquire* article ("Trip to Hanoi"), she wrote: "Made miserable and angry for four years by knowledge of the excruciating suffering of the Vietnamese people at the hands of my government, now that I was actually there and being plied with gifts and flowers and rhetoric and tea and seemingly exaggerated kindness, I didn't feel any more than I already had ten thousand miles away. But being in Hanoi was far more mysterious, more puzzling intellectually, than I expected. I found that I couldn't avoid worrying and wondering how well I understood the Vietnamese, and they me and my country. Yet this problem I posed for myself, frustrating as it proved, was perhaps the most important and fruitful one, at least to me." She insisted that she did not go to Hanoi seeking information: "Like anyone who cared about Vietnam in the last years, I already knew a great deal; and I could not hope to collect more or significantly better information in a mere two weeks than was already available."

Predictably, Miss Sontag's lore on North Vietnam was drawn exclusively from the most extreme leftist sources: "Ranging from the early reports in the *New York Times* by Harrison Salisbury of his visit in December and January of 1966-67 (later expanded into a book, *Behind the Lines: Hanoi*) and *The Other Side,* the book written jointly by Staughton Lynd and Tom Hayden, the first Americans from the anti-war movement to visit North Vietnam, to the analyses of Philippe Devillers and Jean Lacouture in the French press, to the recent articles by Mary McCarthy which I've been reading since my return to the United States, a multiple account has accumulated which conveys in vivid detail how Hanoi and large parts of North Vietnam appear to a sympathetic or at least reasonably objective outsider looking on." She also relied on atrocity pictures and statistics "supplied by courtesy of television and the *New York Times* and *Life.*"

Miss Sontag was in complete command of the twists and turns of anti-French, anti-United States, and pro-North Vietnamese propaganda that had become standard fare for the left wing long before she visited Hanoi: "Anyone who wants to can get information on the achievements of the country since the French left in 1954: the expansion of medical services, the reorganization of education, the creation of a modest industrial base, and the beginnings of diversified agriculture. Even easier to obtain are extensive details of the years of merciless bombing by the United States of all the population centers of North Vietnam – with the exception of downtown Hanoi (which has, however, been doused with 'anti-personnel' or fragmentation bombs, those that don't harm buildings but only kill people) – and the destruction of virtually all the new schools and hospitals and factories built since 1954, as well as most bridges, theatres, pagodas, and Catholic churches and cathedrals."

Throughout her account, Miss Sontag returned to the theme of atrocious bombing by Americans, but she assured her readers "our North Vietnamese hosts seemed anything but eager to ply us with atrocities." At the same time, she recounted how the hosts sometimes overcame their reticence: "We were taken to see towns where formerly no fewer than twenty thousand and as many as eighty thousand people lived in which not a single building was standing. We saw photographs of bodies riddled with pellets from fragmentation bombs or charred by incendiary weapons (besides napalm, the Americans also drop white phosophorus, Thermit, and magnesium on the Vietnamese). We met briefly with some forlorn victims of 'the escalation,' among them a girl of twenty-four whose husband and mother-in-law and children had been killed in a single raid, and an elderly Mother Superior and two young nuns who were the only survivors of the bombing of a Catholic convent located not far south of Hanoi."

If Miss Sontag was to be believed, American airmen had the uncanny skill to drop most of their bombs on homes, elderly women and men, children, hospitals, religious and educational institutions, and farms. As a contrast to the barbaric Americans, she found North Vietnamese society peaceful, viable, and optimistic. She was deeply impressed by their "incredible matter-of-factness." Ever ready to repeat second-hand "information," she wrote: "We were told that in heavily bombed places in the countryside it's common for the farmers to take their coffins with them each day when they go to the rice fields, so that if someone dies he can be buried right then while the others continue working. In the evacuated schools, children pack up their personal belongings and bedding before they leave the dormitory hut each morning for classes and pile the tiny bundles neatly in the nearest dirt shelter, in case during the day there is a bombing raid and the hut burns down; each evening they take their bundles out of the shelter, unpack them, and set up the dormitory again."

In one burst of emotion, Miss Sontag said of the North Vietnamese: "I want their victory." And she candidly admitted that she was nothing less than a pro-North Vietnamese propagandist: "We have a role: American friends of the Vietnamese struggle. (About forty Americans in some way connected with the anti-war movement in the States have made this trip before us.) The trip to Hanoi is a kind of reward or patronage. We are being given a treat, being thanked for our unsolicited efforts; and then we are to return home with a reinforced sense of solidarity, to continue our separate ways of opposing the current American policy."

After just two weeks of a thoroughly guided visit to North Vietnam, Miss Sontag found that "North Vietnam is simultaneously a martial society, completely mobilized for armed struggle, and a deeply civil society which places great value on gentleness and the demands of the heart." Of the individual North Vietnamese, without exception, she wrote: "They . . . believe, incredible as it may seem considering their present situation, that life is full of joy. Joy is to be discerned behind what is already so remarkable: the ease and total lack of self-pity with which people worked a backbreaking number of hours, or daily faced the possibility of their own death and the death of those they love." In another passage, she demonstrated the extent to which she would go to prove the goodness of America's enemies: "And as the quality of Vietnamese love differs from ours, so does the nature of their hate. Of course the Vietnamese hate the Americans in some sense – but not as Americans would, if we had been subjected to equivalent punishment at the hands of a superior power. The North Vietnamese genuinely care about the welfare of the hundreds of captured American pilots and give them bigger rations than the Vietnamese population gets, 'because they're bigger than we are,' as a Vietnamese army officer told me, 'and they're used to more meat than we are.' People in North Vietnam really do believe in the goodness of man ('People in every country are good,' Ho [chi Minh] said in 1945, 'only the governments are bad.'), and in the perennial possibility of rehabilitating the morally fallen, among whom they include implacable enemies, even the Americans. In spite of all the stiff words disseminated by the Vietnamese, it's impossible not to be convinced by the genuineness of these concerns."

Even the North Vietnamese leaders must have been somewhat embarrassed when they read Miss Sontag's effusive description of the relationship between the North Vietnamese government and its subject peoples: "For instance, when love enters into the substance of social relations, the connection of people to a single party need not be dehumanizing. Though it's second nature for me to suspect the government of a Communist country of being oppressive and rigid, if not worse, most of my preconceptions about the misuses of state power in North Vietnam were really an abstraction. Against that abstract suspiciousness I must set (and be overruled by) what I actually saw when I was there – that the North Vietnamese genuinely love and admire their leaders; and, even more inconceivable to us, that the government loves the people. I remember the poignant, intimate tones in Pham Van Dong's voice as he described the sufferings the Vietnamese have endured in the last quarter of a century and their heroism, decency, and essential innocence. Seeing for the first time in my life a prime minister praising the moral character of his country's people with tears in his eyes has modified my ideas about the conceivable relations between rulers and ruled, and given me a more complex reaction to what I would ordinarily dismiss as mere propaganda."

Miss Sontag's admiration for the North Vietnamese government and people was matched by her feelings for the Cuban government and people. She spent three months in Cuba during the first year of Castro's rule. Nine years later she re-visited Cuba and paid tribute to the Castro regime in *Ramparts* magazine, "Some Thoughts on the Right Way (for us) to Love the Cuban Revolution," April 1969. She found the Cuban revolution a good deal more understandable to American radicals than what was going on in North Vietnam: "Besides being exemplary in many respects that are particularly congenial to Americans, the Cuban revolution is not presented behind the barrier of exoticism that can become so formidable when trying to understand the Vietnamese revolution."

In the full context of her *Ramparts* article, Miss Sontag seemed determined to prove to Americans of the New Left how much they could benefit from the experiences of Castro's revolution. She dwelt at length upon "energy," as expended by New Leftists and the Cuban people. Her view of the New Leftists in America was: "The new energies American radicals are particularly devoted to unleashing in this country are those of the individual life-history, of private passion; the energies of outraged selves, cheated by the society of their humanity and their vitality, seeking fulfillment. The analysis of American radicals counsels various kinds of retreat from the rough, dehumanizing embrace of the corporate life-killers (family, school, jobs, the Army) to locate a new focus of energy. For some, this focus is exclusively private, often crudely hedonistic; for more and more people, it is found in new independent communities and families and affinity groups, voluntarily constituted. But in Cuba this perspective does not make sense; indeed it is positively counterrevolutionary. A society in which a revolution has come to power can hardly find reinforcement for revolutionary consciousness in a view which makes 'society' the enemy."

With her flair for fantasy, Miss Sontag found the Cuban people expending their energies to achieve social consciousness: "As Ché [Guevara] stated in his famous 'Man and Socialism in Cuba' and Fidel [Castro] has reiterated many times, the Cuban leadership measures the revolution's success first of all by its progress in creating a new consciousness, and only secondly by the development of the country's economic productivity upon which the securing of its political viability depends." She found the Cuban people with an "enormous energy-level. It is still common, as it has been throughout the ten years of the revolution, for people to go without sleep – talking and working several nights a week. In the way that the Cubans talk, too, and in the extraordinary accomplishments of labor and productivity, it seems as if the whole country is high on some beneficent kind of speed, and has been for ten years. They are high. Like all revolutions, the Cuban one is a reorganization – and a vast release – of human energy. Needless to say, this release of energy is experienced as 'liberating.' Even deprived of the right to go into private business or to see pornographic films, the great majority of Cubans feel vastly more free today than they ever did before the revolution . . . . The way the Cubans have of making work seem like fun (lots of talking, joking, high noise level, lack of punctuality, irregular hours, absence of hierarchy and deference, and plenty of inefficiency) reassures American radicals who have dreaded discovering anything like the regimentation and bureaucratic lifelessness which make a mockery of the pretensions to revolutionary socialism in most countries belonging to the 'socialist camp.' On this score, the American visitors are right to be reassured. After ten years of revolution . . . the Cuban revolution is astonishingly free of repression and bureaucratization."

With a monumental disdain for historical truths, Miss Sontag offered a bizarre explanation for the behavior of the Cuban peoples: "The difference arises because, unlike us, the Cubans have an acute sense of underdevelopment. I don't mean only underdevelopment as an economic reality, although this can hardly be underestimated – Cuba as part of the Third World, a backward, basically one-crop Caribbean island with seven million inhabitants, almost all of them illiterate when the revolution came to power. I mean underdevelopment as the Cubans themselves continually speak of it – as a moral and cultural and historical phenomenon. This is the underdevelopment which is the heritage of a rather complex set of causes – certain aspects of the culture brought by the Spaniards, the still strong African strand in Cuban culture, and the demoralizing and corrupting influence of American colonialism – both the economic hegemony and the impact of American tourist culture, located particularly in Havana and on the Isle of Pines. It is out of these not very promising elements that Cuba's human resources were formed." And somehow, in Castro's police state, Miss Sontag discovered that "the Cubans are devoting a great deal of effort to safeguarding the voluntary character of their institutions." She also found Cuba's culture improving, morality taking a turn for the better, and a "fierce concern for individual civil liberties."

For Miss Sontag, "America is a cancerous society," but her admiration for Castro's Cuba is unbounded: "The great discovery of the Cuban revolution is perhaps not communism, though it is through choosing to become a communist society that Cuba has survived and lived to play out her historical role. The greatest discovery of the Cuban revolution was the invention of Cuban internationalism, that peculiarly intense form of fraternal international feeling that one feels talking with any articulate Cuban. Havana today, starkly denuded of commodities and comforts as it is, is vibrant with the conviction of being a world capital. And despite all the austerity, any visitor feels this. One feels more in the world, more in touch with events, in Havana, capital of this poor small Caribbean island, than one ever does in such genuinely provincial cities as Rome or Stockholm. The international consciousness of Cubans today is both a tremendous source of élan and a very strict ideological and moral tool."

Collections of Miss Sontag's essays and reviews receive an extraordinary amount of attention from critics in such publications as *Commentary, Life, Saturday Review, New York Times, New Leader, New Republic,* and other leftist journals. Oddly enough, her critics generally psychoanalyze Miss Sontag as much as they analyze her writings, in which they somehow discern profound metaphysical undertones. Essentially, however, the burden of her writings is simply a defense of pornography, draft dodgers, homosexuality, black militants, the drug culture, and the sexual revolution.

EDWARD J. SPARLING was born on November 22, 1896 in Panoche, California, son of Gertrude Smith and Edward Sparling. He married Marion Bailey. He is an alumnus of Stanford University (A.B., 1921) and Columbia University (A.M., 1925; Ph.D., 1933).

From 1921 until 1924, Sparling was the assistant general secretary of the YMCA at Stanford University. From 1925 until 1928, he was a high school teacher in Palo Alto, California. From 1930 until 1932, he was the assistant director of personnel at Long Island University. In 1933 and 1934, he was the educational director of the Christodora House in New York City. From 1934 until 1936, he was dean of men and a professor of psychology at Hiram College in Ohio. From 1936 until 1945, he was president of the Central YMCA College in Chicago. From 1945 until 1964, he was the founding president of Roosevelt University; he became president emeritus in 1964. (Early in Sparling's presidency, Roosevelt University became a hotbed of Reds. When the Seditious Activities Investigation Commission of the Illinois Legislature inquired into the "seditious and subversive" activities at the University, Sparling testified. He defended and praised the Reds on the University's campus and proclaimed that "Communism is only behind the Iron Curtain.")

Sparling has been a member of the ultra-radical Americans for Democratic Action. He has been a long-time member of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He was affiliated with the leftist-internationalist United Nations Association of Greater Chicago. He joined other leftists in working to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been a national official of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness, and also of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He is a long-time official of the leftist American Committee on Africa.

SPROUL

ROBERT G. SPROUL was born on May 22, 1891 in San Francisco, son of Sarah Moore and Robert Sproul. He married Ida Wittschen. He is an alumnus of the University of California (B.S., 1913).

From 1920 until 1958, Sproul was at the University of California: as comptroller and secretary to the regents (1920-1930); vice president (1925-1930); president (1930-1958); and since 1958, he has been president emeritus.

Away from his campus duties, Sproul has had the ritualistic affiliations of a top-level member of the left-liberal Establishment. He was associated with the socialist-oriented Rockefeller Foundation from 1939 until 1956, and with the statist-oriented Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching from 1939 until 1958. He has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist Institute for International Education, the World Affairs Council of Northern California, the Atlantic Union Committee, and the United World Federalists. He has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Committee for Economic Development. He has been a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

Sproul's most important contribution to the left was in the 1930's and 1940's when he was a top official of the Institute of Pacific Relations. In 1952, after one of the most extensive congressional investigations of all time, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee reported: "The Institute of Pacific Relations has not maintained the character of an objective, scholarly, and research organization. The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence. The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information including information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

"A small core of officials and staff members carried the main burden of IPR activities and directed its administration and policies. Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.

"There is no evidence that the large majority of its members supported the IPR for any reason except to advance the professed research and scholarly purposes of the organization. Most members of the IPR, and most members of its Board of Trustees, were inactive and obviously without any influence over the policies of the organization and the conduct of its affairs.

"IPR activities were made possible largely through the financial support of American industrialists, corporations, and foundations, the majority of whom were not familiar with the inner workings of the organization. The effective leadership of the IPR often sought to deceive IPR contributors and supporters as to the true character and activities of the organization. Neither the IPR nor any substantial body of those associated with it as executive officers, trustees or major financial contributors, has ever made any serious and objective investigation of the charges that the IPR was infiltrated by Communists and was used for pro-Communist and pro-Soviet purposes. The names of eminent individuals were by design used as a respectable and impressive screen for the activities of the IPR inner core, and as a defense when such activities came under scrutiny . . . .

"The effective leadership of the IPR used IPR prestige to promote the interests of the Soviet Union in the United

States. A group of persons operating within and about the Institute of Pacific Relations exerted a substantial influence on United States far eastern policy. The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives."

Sproul was a part of "the effective leadership of the IPR" in the most damaging era of the IPR's influence. Nevertheless, he has held many consultant and advisory positions with various federal government agencies, including the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, the War Manpower Commission, the Allied Commission on Reparations, the Department of the Interior, and the Veterans Administration. In 1956, he served briefly as a special ambassador to Korea.

[ALVAH] EUGENE STALEY was born on July 3, 1906 in Friend, Nebraska, son of Helen Browne and Alvah Staley. He married Phyllis Parker. He is an alumnus of Hastings College (A.B., 1925) and the University of Chicago (Ph.D., 1928). From 1929 until 1931, on a fellowship from the leftist Social Science Research Council, he engaged in study and research in Paris, Geneva, Berlin, Kiel, London, and the Balkans. He is the author of *History of Illinois State Federation of Labor* (1930); *War and the Private Investor* (1953); *Raw Materials in Peace and War* (1937); *World Economy in Transition* (1939); *World Economic Development: Effects on Advanced Industrial Countries* (1944); *The Future of Underdeveloped Countries* (1954 and 1961); *Modern Small Industry for Developing Countries* (1965); and *Planning Occupational Education and Training for Development* (1968).

From 1931 until 1937, Staley was an assistant professor of economics at the University of Chicago. In 1934 and 1935, while on leave of absence from Chicago, he was an assistant professor at the Graduate Institute of International Studies at Geneva, Switzerland. From 1937 until 1944, he was at Tufts University's Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy as associate professor (1937-1939) and professor (1939-1944) of international economic relations. From 1942 until 1944, he was an economist with the federal Administrator for Export Control, the United States Bureau of the Budget, the Department of State, and the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. In 1944, he was a member of UNRRA's mission to China. (UNRRA was widely infiltrated by Communists and fellow travelers. In China, UNRRA spent millions of dollars on roads, railways, and flood control projects. Communist guerrillas destroyed UNRRA's work while simultaneously receiving UNRRA relief supplies. American officials in UNRRA insisted that the Chinese Communists receive a due proportion of UNRRA aid.)

In 1944 and 1945, Staley was a professor of international economic relations at the School of Advanced International Studies and Foreign Service Training Center in Washington, D.C. In 1945 and 1946, he lectured on international trade at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business. From 1947 until 1949, he was executive director of the World Affairs Council of Northern California, an offshoot of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which was an "instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence." From 1948 until 1950, he was a research associate at the Hoover Institute and Library on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University. From 1948 until 1968, he was at Stanford University and the Stanford Research Institute: as consultant (1948-1950); senior international economist (1950-1968); and director of basic research (1957-1965) and professor of education (1965-1968) at the international development center.

In 1945, Staley was a member of the U.S. secretariat at the founding session of the United Nations. In 1946 and 1947 and again in 1961, he was a consultant to the United Nations Economic Affairs Department. In 1950 and 1951, he was the senior economist on a survey mission in Cuba for the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development. In 1952 and 1953, he was the director of a study project on economic development for the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. From 1955 until 1957, in 1961, and in 1967 and 1968, he was a consultant on industrial development to the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation and to the Socialist government of India. In 1961, he was chairman of a special United States financial and economic mission to South Vietnam. He was a consultant on industrial development to Colombia in 1962 and to Peru in 1964. In 1963, he was a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on applied science and technology for the benefit of less developed areas. In 1964, he was a consultant to the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation and to the Socialist government of the United Arab Republic on the regional planning of Aswan. Since 1968, he has been a project specialist in occupational education for the socialist-oriented Ford Foundation in India.

For more than twenty years, Staley has been a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations. In recent years, he has been affiliated with the leftist-internationalist International Movement for Atlantic Union.

In 1952, when the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee was in the midst of its monumental investigation of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Staley submitted an affidavit to the Subcommittee. He wrote: "I have never been a Communist, or a member of the Communist Party, or a fellow-traveler, any implication or suggestion that I have been is completely untrue and does me irreparable damage." – "...I believe deeply and honestly in the principles of freedom on which the American government and the American economic and social system are founded, and I am decidedly opposed to the philosophy, aims, and practices of Communism and Communist regimes. The Communist world movement is in my view the greatest menace in the world today, both to America and to the broad interests of humanity. It seems superfluous to add, though I am glad to do so for the record, that I have never been a member of the Communist Party and have never sought to advance the Communist cause of propaganda through 'front' activities or in other ways. Far from looking to the Communist 'line' for guidance in my conclusions as a social scientist or in my efforts to assist in public education on world affairs, I have consistently opposed key Communist doctrines and have on numerous crucial issues advocated policies such as no one 'considerate of the Kremlin' could possibly advocate. This is true not only lately but over the years."

Staley was a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations from 1937 until 1948. He was chairman of the IPR's research committee from 1941 until

1943. He was a trustee of the IPR in 1942 and 1943. He attended IPR's international conferences in 1939 and 1945. He was director of the Bay Region (San Francisco) Division of the IPR, and when it merged into the World Affairs Council of Northern California, he served as executive director (1947-1949). He contributed to the IPR's publications, *Far Eastern Survey* and *Pacific Affairs.*

When the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee completed its hearings on the IPR, it reported: "The Institute of Pacific Relations has not maintained the character of an objective, scholarly, and research organization. The IPR has been considered by the American Communist Party and by Soviet officials as an instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence. The IPR disseminated and sought to popularize false information including information originating from Soviet and Communist sources.

"A small core of officials and staff members carried the main burden of IPR activities and directed its administration and policies. Members of the small core of officials and staff members who controlled IPR were either Communist or pro-Communist.

"There is no evidence that the large majority of its members supported the IPR for any reason except to advance the professed research and scholarly purposes of the organization. Most members of the IPR, and most members of its Board of Trustees, were inactive and obviously without any influence over the policies of the organization and the conduct of its affairs.

"IPR activities were made possible largely through the financial support of American industrialists, corporations, and foundations, the majority of whom were not familiar with the inner workings of the organization. The effective leadership of the IPR often sought to deceive IPR contributors and supporters as to the true character and activities of the organization. Neither the IPR nor any substantial body of those associated with it as executive officers, trustees or major financial contributors, has ever made any serious and objective investigation of the charges that the IPR was infiltrated by Communists and was used for pro-Communist and pro-Soviet purposes. The names of eminent individuals were by design used as a respectable and impressive screen for the activities of the IPR inner core, and as a defense when such activities came under scrutiny . . . .

"The effective leadership of IPR worked consistently to set up actively cooperative and confidential relationships with persons in Government involved in the determination of foreign policy . . . . It was the continued practice of IPR to seek to place in Government posts both persons associated with IPR and other persons selected by the effective leadership of IPR. The IPR possessed close organic relations with the State Department through interchange of personnel, attendance of State Department officials at IPR conferences, constant exchange of information and social contacts.

"The effective leadership of the IPR used IPR prestige to promote the interests of the Soviet Union in the United States. A group of persons operating within and about the Institute of Pacific Relations exerted a substantial influence on United States far eastern policy. The IPR was a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives.

"A group of persons associated with the IPR attempted, between 1941 and

1945, to change United States policy so as to accommodate Communist ends and to set the stage for a major United States policy change, favorable to Soviet interests, in 1945. Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent were influential in bringing about a change in United States policy in 1945 favorable to the Chinese Communists. During the period 1945-49, persons associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations were instrumental in keeping United States policy on a course favorable to Communist objectives in China. Persons associated with the IPR were influential in 1949 in giving United States far eastern policy a direction that furthered Communist purposes.

"A chief function of the IPR has been to influence United States public opinion . . . . The net effect of IPR activities on United States public opinion has been such as to serve international Communist interests and to affect adversely the interests of the United States."

JEREMY J. STONE was born on November 23, 1935 in New York City. He is an alumnus of Swarthmore College (B.A., 1957) and Stanford University (Ph.D., 1961). In 1957 and 1958, he held a fellowship from the leftist-oriented Social Science Research Council. From 1958 until 1960, he held a fellowship from the National Science Foundation. He is the author of *Containing the Arms Race: Some Specific Proposals* (1966) and *Strategic Persuasion: Arms Limitations through Dialogue* (1967).

From 1960 until 1962, Stone was a research mathematician at the Stanford Research Institute. From 1962 until 1964, he was on the staff of the Hudson Institute, a "think factory," where he specialized in national security and arms control. From 1964 until 1966, he was a research associate at Harvard University's Center for International Affairs. From 1966 until 1968, he was an assistant professor of mathematics and a lecturer on government at Pomona College. In 1968 and 1969, he was a Social Science Research Council fellow at Stanford University. In 1969 and 1970, he was an international affairs fellow of the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington, D.C. Most recently, Stone has been a spokesman for the Ripon Society (a tiny but well-publicized group of ultra-left so-called Republicans) and director of the Federation of American Scientists (a bleeding-heart group, members of which are generally affiliated with a variety of radical one-world and/or pacifist organizations).

Although Stone is basically a mathematician by profession, he has acquired a reputation as an expert on national strategic matters related to nuclear weapons, disarmament, and treaty negotiations vis-à-vis the Soviet Union. Articles by Stone have appeared with great frequency in such publications as *Commonweal,* the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, New Republic, Current, Foreign Affairs,* and the *Adelphi Papers* of the Institute for Strategic Studies.

Although Stone is totally without political, diplomatic, and military experience, he has become a luminary in the "strategic intelligence" community within the past decade. He strives mightily to portray himself as holding an objective position between hawks and doves. However, he has all the earmarks of a very frightened dove. His attitude on the Vietnam War is akin to that shared by J. William Fulbright, Edward F. Kennedy, and George McGovern. In *Commonweal* (March 21, 1969), he summarized his reflections upon the Vietnam War: "In

Vietnam, we practiced to deceive; the web we wove is the measure of that deception. We started from the premise that South Vietnam was a sovereign state, a vital interest, and a free society. By a policy of gradual escalation, we tried to make caution seem implacable tactics in a war of nerves. We pretended that the aggression was clearer in fact and law than it was. We pretended that the South Vietnamese were more unified in resistance than they were. We lied about body counts. We pretended Khe Sanh and Tet were victories and distorted the events in the Tonkin Gulf. We pretended we could not be held responsible for South Vietnamese torture of prisoners or political repression of dissidents. We pretended the U.S. Senate had freely given its authority to the war. We pretended repeatedly that the war could be won rapidly, and bemused ourselves with statistics."

Stone ridicules any who fear Communist takeovers in Southeast Asia or Latin America. He downgrades the threat of Communist aggression anywhere in the world; he appears much more fearful of the alleged military-industrial complex in the United States. He has great faith in the willingness of Soviet leaders to negotiate honestly and to abide by disarmament treaties. His faith was greater, however, when Nikita Khrushchev was in power. Writing in *Foreign Affairs* (January 1970), Stone explained: "Earlier in this decade, the Soviet leadership reflected Mr. Khrushchev's intense interest in such related issues as de-Stalinization, dismantling the cold war, improving Soviet economic standards and liberalizing Soviet political conditions. Now the leadership is less dynamic and more conservative; the doves seem fairly well isolated." (Khrushchev – a dove?)

Stone deplores any and all defensive progress by the United States. He warns of the dire result of an arms race, a nuclear holocaust. He offers the same type of extreme arguments for disarmament that members of the American surrender lobby, the Pugwash veterans, manage to convey through the leftist-pacifist wing of the Congress and of the press media, and through the outpourings of the various "think factories."

Typical of Stone's tortuous arguments for disarmament were those he advanced when he spoke out against the Nixon Administration's anti-ballistic missile program: "Dr. Stone said that although the ABM's were defensive, if they served to neutralize Soviet attack missiles, which Moscow regards as a 'deterrent,' then the Soviet Union would somehow seek to increase its 'deterrent' potential, and the resultant arms race would be the same as if the ABM were an offensive arm." (*New York Times*, May 23, 1969.)

ANNA LORD STRAUSS was born on September 20, 1899 in New York City, daughter of Lucretia Lord and Albert Strauss. She attended a secretarial school.

From 1918 until 1920, Miss Strauss was a secretary with the Federal Reserve Board, the United States Shipping Board, the War Trade Board, and the Department of State. In 1921 and 1922, she was an American Red Cross Worker. From 1923 until 1929, she was with *Century* magazine, successively as secretary, assistant to the editor, assistant editor, and managing editor. In 1930, she worked for the Community Organization Society of New York City. From 1931 until 1933, she was a librarian in New York's Department of Labor. In 1933 and 1934, she was a consumer representative with the New Deal's National Recovery Administration in New York City.

In 1933, Miss Strauss began an active career, which has lasted to the present, with the leftwing League of Women Voters. In 1933, she was chairman of the government and consumer committee of the LWV in New York City. From 1937 to 1943, she was president of the LWV in New York City. From 1934 until 1936, she was national secretary of the LWV, and from 1936 until 1938, she was second vice president of the LWV's national board of directors. From 1944 until 1950, she was the LWV's national president. In December 1969, Miss Strauss and her two sisters donated one million dollars to the LWV.

In 1945, Miss Strauss was a member of the U.S. delegation to the first conference of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. In 1946, she was a member of President Truman's Famine Emergency Committee. In 1951 and 1952, she was a member of the U.S. delegation to the Paris meeting of the United Nations General Assembly. In 1951, she was executive vice chairman of President Truman's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights. In 1953, she was an educational exchange representative for the Department of State in Southeast Asia. In 1956, she was chairman of the letter-writing committee of President Eisenhower's People-to-People program, and at the same time, she was a member of President Eisenhower's Committee on Education beyond High School.

Miss Strauss's do-goodism has been especially directed on behalf of the United Nations since 1945. She has been an activist in such pro-UN propaganda agencies as the American Association for the United Nations, the United States Committee for the United Nations, the United Nations Association of the United States, and the World Affairs Centers. She has also been active in such leftist-liberal Establishment groups as the Foreign Policy Association, the Committee for Economic Development, the African-American Institute, Republicans for Progress, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party. The only Communist-front affiliation on her record was with the Consumers National Federation. In many respects she has been the Republican counterpart of the late Eleanor Roosevelt, with whom she once shared an award from Bryn Mawr College.

DIRK STRUIK was born on September 30, 1894 in Rotterdam, The Netherlands, son of Artje Schilperoort and Hendrik Struik. He married Saly Ramler. He is an alumnus of the University of Leiden (Ph.D., 1922). On a fellowship, he pursued post-doctoral studies at the University of Rome (1924-1925) and the University of Göttingen (1925-1926).

From 1917 until 1924, Struik was an assistant in the department of mathematics at the Technische Hoogeschool at Delft, The Netherlands. He came to the United States in 1926 and was naturalized in 1934.

From 1926 until 1960, he was in the department of mathematics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, successively as a lecturer, assistant professor, associate professor, professor, and emeritus professor. In 1963 and 1964, he was a visiting professor at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands. He has also lectured in Germany, Puerto Rico, Italy, and the Soviet Union.

On April 8, 1949, Herbert Philbrick, who had been in the Communist Party as an undercover informant for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, testified under oath in a federal court that he knew Struik as a lecturer in a Communist cell meeting. At a press conference, Struik denied that he had ever been a Communist. Philbrick, whose testimony was given at the trial of Communist Party leaders, was denounced as "a stool pigeon" by Struik, who characterized the trial of the Reds as "an incredible scandal." (At that time, the authorities at MIT took no action against Struik.)

On July 23, 1951, Philbrick testified before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He identified Struik as having been a fellow member of a Communist Party cell for six months in the Boston area. On the following day, Struik testified before the HCUA. He was questioned about his Communist Party membership, his lectures for the Communist Party, Communist infiltration of defense plants, and Communist influence upon the education of youth. To such inquiries Struik responded with a plea for protection under the Fifth Amendment. He did admit, however, that he was a Marxist and a registered Democrat. (The authorities at MIT took no action against Struik.)

On September 12, 1951, a Middlesex County (Massachusetts) grand jury indicted Struik on charges of having advocated the overthrow of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by force and of having conspired to overthrow by force the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the United States government. (President James R. Killian Jr. of MIT suspended Struik *with pay.*)

Before the HCUA, three of Struik's colleagues from MIT – all of whom had been Communists – testified under oath that they had known Struik as a member of the Communist Party: William T. Martin and Isadore Amdur on April 22, 1953, and Norman Levinson on April 23, 1953. All three individuals repeated the same identification, under oath, before the Massachusetts Legislative Commission on Communism in 1954.

On April 2, 1956, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that the federal government had exclusive jurisdiction in sedition cases. On May 25, 1956, the charges against Struik in Middlesex County were quashed. On May 26, 1956, MIT's Committee on Academic Responsibility recommended to the Executive Committee of MIT's Corporation "that no action be taken with respect to Dr. Struik's status which, as of May 25, 1956, is that of Professor of Mathematics with tenure. We regret his use of the Fifth Amendment and particularly deplore its use for purposes for which it was not intended. We have concluded that Dr. Struik deserves censure for his comparative lack of candor with members of the administration." The Executive Committee of MIT's Corporation, under the leadership of James R. Killian Jr., immediately reinstated Struik.

On December 11, 1956, Herbert Philbrick and James W. Glatis, who also served as an FBI undercover man in the Communist Party, testified before the Massachusetts Legislative Commission on Communism. Philbrick again swore that he had known Struik within the Communist Party. Glatis swore to his personal experiences with Struik in Communist front activities.

On December 10, 1956, in executive session, and on December 18, 1956, in public session, Struik testified before the Massachusetts Commission. He denied that he had ever joined or considered himself a member of the Communist Party of the United States. He did admit, however, that for a brief time in 1920 he had belonged to the Communist Party in Holland. He also admitted that prior to 1951 he had associated with and lectured to Communists but insisted that after 1951 he had disassociated himself from the Communist Party. In reply to many other questions, Struik invoked the Massachusetts constitutional provision against self-incrimination. His testimony, in general, was marked by arrogance and evasiveness. At no time did Struik offer tangible proof to refute the testimony of Philbrick and others who had associated with him in the Communist Party and Communist fronts. But after his appearance before the Massachusetts Commission, he continued his tenure as a member of MIT's faculty until his retirement in 1960.

In 1961, at a fund-raising dinner for the *People's World,* a Communist Party publication, Struik was the principal speaker. In his remarks to an audience of Communists and fellow travelers, he said: "I am proud to shake the hand of the publishers of such magnificent papers as the *People's World,* who struggle under such difficult conditions. The big lie has been used in building a curtain of prejudice around our progressive press. This consists of the myth that there is a gigantic Communist conspiracy directed by an alien power without morals which is aimed at your home and your freedoms. As I have travelled among progressives I have never met a Communist conspirator. Communists don't preach the violent overthrow of the government but a socialistic change through peaceful means." It appeared that Struik was trying to prove he was untouchable now that he was safely retired from MIT.

In 1956, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee included Struik's name in its list of the eighty-two most active and typical sponsors of Communist front organizations. (In his testimony before the Massachusetts commission, he admitted to some Communist front activity.) Struik has been affiliated with the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom ("Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"); the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the American Slav Congress ("subversive and Communist"); American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy ("Communist"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the International Labor Defense ("legal arm of the Communist Party"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee of One Thousand ("Communist created and controlled front organization"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder ("Communist"); the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee ("Communist front"); the National Committee to Abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist"); the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – "a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and 'Soviet culture' "); the Conference on Pan-American Democracy ("Communist front"); the Council on Pan-American Democracy ("subversive and Communist" – "Communist front"); the Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War ("Communist-led"); the Emergency Peace Mobilization ("Communist front"); the Committee for Citizenship Rights ("to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); Open Letter in Defense of Harry Bridges ("Communist front"); Open Letter for Closer Cooperation with the Soviet Union ("a group of Communist Party stooges"); *Masses and Mainstream* ("a Communist magazine"); *New Masses* ("weekly journal of the Communist Party"); *Spotlight* ("official organ" of American Youth for Democracy – "subversive and Communist"); *New Horizons for Youth* (Communist front publication); the United American Spanish Aid Committee ("Communist").

Struik has been a trustee of the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"). He has signed statements defending the Communist Party, defending Communist schools, supporting Communist bookshops, and defending individual Communists. He was a celebrant at the eightieth birthday party for Communist Party stalwart Alexander Trachtenberg. He was a celebrant at the fortieth anniversary fete for International Publishers, the Communist Party's official publishing house. He sent greetings to the Soviet Union on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. At the fifteenth national convention of the Communist Party, USA he was singled out for praise by Communist leaders for his labors "in the cause of peace."

While on MIT's faculty, he taught in secret schools of sedition for the Communist Party in the Boston area. He taught at the Communist Party's Samuel Adams School. ("Dirk was cold and calculating – perhaps the prototype of the pure scientist. He was not only a great mathematician but an expert in Marxist theory as well; he combined these two fields in his flat assumption that Stalinism was founded in science. I have heard him lecture many times at the Samuel Adams School; he could hold a class of Communists and non-Communists alike absolutely spellbound, reeling off names, dates, facts, and figures in accurate detail without even glancing at his notes." – Herbert Philbrick, *I Led Three Lives,* 1952, page 240).

Struik has been a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He remains as an editor of *Science and Society* ("Communist publication"), and in recent years has been affiliated with the New York School for Marxist Studies, a Communist Party operation.

STANLEY I. STUBER was born on August 24, 1903 in Gardiner, Maine, son of Edith Henderson and Benjamin Stuber. He married Helen Hill. He is an alumnus of Bates College (A.B., 1926), Rochester Theological Seminary (B.D., 1928), and Colgate Rochester Divinity School (Th.M., 1929). In 1928, he was ordained to the ministry of the Baptist

Church. He is the author of *The Living Water* (1927); *How We Got Our Denominations* (1928); *Treasury of the Christian Faith* (1948); *Public Relations Manual* (1951); *The Christian Reader* (1952); *Primer on Roman Catholicism for Protestants* (1953); *Basic Christian Writings* (1957); *How Protestants Differ from Roman Catholics* (1961); *Who We Are* (1962); and *Implementing Vatican II in Your Community* (1966).

From 1924 until 1937, he served as a pastor in Maine and New York. From 1938 until 1941, he was a chaplain and consultant at the Clifton Springs Sanitarium and Clinic in Clifton Springs, New York. From 1941 until 1949, he worked for the Northern Baptist Convention as national publicity secretary (1941-1945); executive secretary for world relief (1942-1949); and national director of public relations (1945-1949). From 1950 until 1956, he was executive secretary of the Japan International Christian University Foundation. From 1956 until 1960, he was general secretary of the Greater Kansas City Council of Churches in Missouri. From 1961 until 1964, he was executive director of the Missouri Council of Churches. Since 1964, he has been the director of the YMCA's Association Press. From 1942 until 1955, he did extensive public relations work for the ultra-radical Federal Council of Churches and its successor, the National Council of Churches. From 1942 until 1948, he was editor of *The Pastor's Newsletter*. From 1962 until 1964, he was an observer at Vatican Council II.

Away from his work with religious institutions, Stuber had affiliations with the American Committee for Spanish Freedom ("Communist"); the American-Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); and the National Emergency Conference ("Communist front").

PAUL M. SWEEZY was born on April 10, 1910 in New York City, son of Caroline Wilson and Everett Sweezy. His second wife is Zirel Druskin. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1931; Ph.D., 1937). He pursued graduate studies also at the London School of Economics and in Vienna. He is the author of *The Theory of Capitalist Development* (1942), *Socialism* (1948), *The Present as History* (1953), and *Monopoly Capital* (1966), and co-author with Leo Huberman of *Cuba: Anatomy of a Revolution* (1960 and 1961).

From 1934 until 1946, Sweezy was, successively, an instructor and an assistant professor of economics at Harvard University. During World War II, he was in the U.S. Army and was assigned to the Office of Strategic Services.

In 1949, Sweezy and Leo Huberman founded and became co-editors of *Monthly Review*, which they described as "an independent socialist magazine." In their introductory editorial, Sweezy and Huberman paid tribute to the Soviet Union for leaving "the possibility and workability" of Socialism "no longer open to doubt." Said the co-editors: "We are convinced that the sooner the United States is transformed from a capitalist to a socialist society, the better it will be not only for Americans but for all mankind." In its first issue, *Monthly Review* featured an article ("Why Socialism?") by the late Albert Einstein, who made a plea for the development of Marxian Socialism wherever it did not exist.

Throughout its history, *Monthly Review* has never deviated from its strong pro-Communist policy, and its heroes have included leaders of the Soviet Union and Red China, and such notorious international Communists as Ché Guevara, Fidel Castro, and Kwame Nkrumah. The March 1965 issue of *Monthly Review* was dedicated to the memory of Paul Baran, a Marxist member of the magazine's staff. Tributes to Baran were sent to *Monthly Review* by Ché Guevara, Polish Communist leader Oscar Lange, and Italy's Communist leader Palmiro Togliatti.

Monthly Review's by-products of books and pamphlets have always been uniformly pro-Communist. About one-third of *Monthly Review's* English language edition goes abroad, and there is a Spanish edition which circulates throughout Latin America.

In the 1950's, while he was delivering a guest-lecture at the University of New Hampshire, it was alleged that Sweezy was disseminating Communist doctrine. The legislature of New Hampshire directed the State's Attorney General to investigate the allegations. During the course of the investigation, Sweezy denied that he was a member of the Communist Party, but he refused to testify about his connections with known Communists. Consequently, he was convicted for contempt; but in 1957, the Supreme Court of the United States reversed the decision of New Hampshire's Supreme Court in favor of Sweezy. (Sweezy's conviction for contempt did not end his career at academic institutions. In 1959 and 1960, he was a visiting professor at Cornell University, in 1961 he was at Stanford University, and in 1964 he was at the New School for Social Research.)

Sweezy has been affiliated with the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee ("Communist front" – "subversive"); the Spanish Refugee Appeal ("subversive" – "Communist front"); the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("initiated by Communists"); the National Lawyers Guild ("the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace ("Communist front" – "a propaganda front for Soviet foreign policy and 'Soviet culture' "); the Jefferson School of Social Science ("adjunct of the Communist Party"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the Citizens' Victory Committee for Harry Bridges ("Communist"); the Fair Play for Cuba Committee ("Castro-subsidized"); the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties ("Communist front"); the Socialist Workers Party ("a subversive and Communist organization"); and *Science and Society* ("Communist publication").

Sweezy was chairman of the Committee in Defense of Carl Marzani, a Communist and convicted perjurer. He was on the Welcoming Committee for Kaoru Yasui, a Japanese Communist leader who was touring the United States. He appealed for amnesty for Communist Party leaders who were convicted under the Smith Act. He was a member of the Alexander Defense Committee, on behalf of Red-racist agitators in South Africa. He supported Bertrand Russell's "international war crimes tribunal," which was nothing less than a Communist project. He has attended various functions of the Communists' *National Guardian;* in 1965, he was an honored guest at the *Guardian's* annual dinner. He has attended at least two annual Socialist Scholars Conferences, which attract ultra-leftists from all over the world. And he has been one of the staunchest apologists for the tyrannical regime of Cuba's Fidel Castro.

HAROLD TAYLOR was born on September 28, 1914 in Toronto, Canada, son of Elizabeth Wilson and Charles Taylor. He married Grace Thorne. He is an alumnus of the University of Toronto (A.B., 1935; M.A., 1936) and the University of London (Ph.D., 1938). He came to the United States in 1939 and was naturalized in 1947.

From 1939 until 1945, Taylor was a faculty member at the University of Wisconsin. From 1939 until 1942, he was an instructor and research fellow in philosophy. From 1942 until 1945, he was an assistant professor of philosophy, and in 1944, he was a research associate in psychology at the University's Office of Scientific Research and Development.

From 1945 until 1959, Taylor was president of Sarah Lawrence College. At Sarah Lawrence, he became one of the foremost practitioners of permissive and "progressive" Deweyite education. In order to develop the "inner-consciousness" of the student, Taylor eliminated required courses, examinations, the credit system, and the traditional methods of grading. (Taylor's devotion to Deweyism shone through his tribute to the patriarch of the educationists at the time of Dewey's death in 1952: "John Dewey started a revolution in the American educational system. He did so by showing teachers and students how to liberate themselves from the tyranny of authority, dogma and indoctrination. He conceived the whole of life as an educational experience and conceived education as the sum total of all experience." Two years earlier, Taylor had established himself in the hierarchy of Deweyites when he wrote: "Education and the colleges are instruments of social transition. Their role is to infuse the social order with ideas concerning the changes which are taking place within it, and continually to make judgments about the direction and quality of these changes. Without them there is no agency through which the ideas and values of contemporary society can be continually tested by men and women who can give most of their time to it, and who care most deeply about it.")

Shortly after Taylor assumed the presidency of Sarah Lawrence and became an American citizen, he embarked on an overt career of leftwing activities that have continued down to the present.

From 1947 until 1949, Taylor was on the faculty of the ultra-radical New School for Social Research. In 1949, he was affiliated with the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"). In 1949, he defended Communist teachers when the *New York Times* quoted him as saying that "as long as the Communist Party is constitutional in this country, an avowed Communist has the right to teach in a college or university. However, whether he should continue to do so depends upon the integrity of his work."

At Sarah Lawrence, Taylor had the opportunity to demonstrate his sympathetic attitude toward Communist teachers. He hired Joseph Barnes ("a valuable addition to our faculty") to lecture on current events. Five ex-Communists had testified under oath that they had known Barnes as a Communist agent. Barnes offered to resign from Sarah Lawrence, but Taylor would not accept the resignation; instead he announced that the college had investigated Barnes' record and found that he was not a security risk. For his part, Taylor was satisfied with Barnes' scholarly integrity, which simply proved that Taylor was either ignorant of, or had never understood, Barnes' manifestly pro-Communist writings, which had spanned almost two decades before he arrived on Sarah Lawrence's faculty. (In an obvious effort to stifle criticism, Taylor issued a policy statement on the matter of Communist teachers: "It is a principle accepted by the faculty, the president and the trustees alike that there is to be no indoctrination of students with a political, philosophical or religious dogma. No person, therefore, who takes his intellectual orders from an outside authority, whether Communist or any other, could be given or could retain the responsibility of membership in the Sarah Lawrence faculty." Unmentioned was how Taylor or anyone else among the college's administrators would determine that a Communist was not taking "intellectual orders from an outside authority." Yet, in 1952, Taylor smugly asserted: "I doubt very much that there is a known member of the Communist Party now teaching in an American college." Such a fatuous remark must have met with amused but appreciative disbelief among Communists who were "known" to each other on campuses – including Sarah Lawrence's – across the country.) (Dr. Harry Gideonse, president of Brooklyn College, commented on Taylor's attitude: "... An indication that a large percentage of the current discussion [on Communist teachers] would cease if the facts of the problem were more clearly understood can be found in the views of President Harold Taylor of Sarah Lawrence College, who – like many other liberal educators – believes that communists should not be excluded [from faculties] because if we begin by 'excluding Communists, we will end by excluding any one who says anything provocative, unorthodox or interesting.' The relevant query in reply is: Do party liners say anything provocative, unorthodox or interesting? Or do they rather conceal their identity and, in the language of *The Communist* inflect their views *at the least risk of exposure?* Dr. Taylor's lack of experience with the real problem is illustrated by his defense of the presence of communists on teaching faculties with the plea that democratic education should provide a 'daily encounter with truth' that is 'free and open.' Such a daily encounter that is free and open is precisely the thing that is impossible with members of a conspiratorial, camouflaged group that have accepted party discipline in intellectual matters." – "Changing Issues in Academic Freedom in the United States Today," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society,* April 1959.)

During and after Taylor's stay at Sarah Lawrence, his leftism took on many forms. He signed a clemency petition for Communists Carl Braden and Frank Wilkinson, who were convicted for contempt of Congress. He became a member of the Committee of One Thousand ("Communist created and controlled front organization"). He sponsored the leftwing-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He became affiliated with the racist-agitating Southern Conference Educational Fund, the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"), and the National Conference for New Politics (a classic united-front third-party movement largely controlled by the Communist Party). He joined leftwing luminaries Michael Harrington, Norman Thomas, and John K. Fairbank in Americans for Reappraisal of Far Eastern Policy to promote United States diplomatic recognition of Red China and United States support for Red China's membership in the United Nations, and to end United States restrictions on trade with Red China. He joined Freedom House's Bookshelf Committee, a representative group of leftwingers who were promoting books written by themselves and other leftwingers. He became a trustee of the ultra-radical Putney School and a trustee of the Institute for International Order, a leftwing-pacifist lobby for the United Nations. He became a vice president and member of the board of directors of the old-time Socialist stronghold, the League for Industrial Democracy. He became a national board member of the ultra-leftist Americans for Democratic Action. He was a special consultant to leftwing presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson. He has been (with ultra-leftist Harvey Cox) on the board of advisors of the Experimental Educational Program, an affiliate of the leftwing-pacifist Center for War/Peace Studies. He has been a special consultant to the Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, organized to "perpetuate the ideals" of the late leftwing warhorse. He was a co-founder and vice president of the Peace Research Institute (later known as the Institute for Policy Studies) and founder and chairman of its National Research Council on Peace Strategy, one of the most prestigious complexes in the entire leftwing-pacifist movement. (It has attracted such radicals to its leadership as Richard Barnet, Marcus Raskin, and the ubiquitous Arthur Larson.)

In 1963, Taylor received the annual award of New York's Teachers Union. The event was deemed of such importance by the Communists that *The Worker* devoted one-half page to the story. The presentation was made by an old Communist stalwart, Rose Russell. (A year later, when Mrs. Russell was given a testimonial dinner, Taylor sent her his felicitations, as did the staff of *The Worker* and a host of Communists.)

In 1963, Taylor organized, in cooperation with a group of Quakers, an experimental "world college" (Friends World College). He announced his ambition to have such a world college established under the aegis of the United Nations. For the experiment, Taylor gathered twenty-two students from as many countries. For six weeks they were under the tutelage of leftwing lecturers. When it was all over, Taylor was satisfied: "The students . . . will never again take a simple national viewpoint. They have had the opportunity to learn at first hand what others thought, and they were impressed." (The students attended seminars with such fascinating titles as: "The Chinese and the Soviet Views of War," "Economic Planning and the New World," "Race as a World Problem," "The Problem of Human Settlement," and "Albert Einstein's Philosophy of Peace.")

In 1964, six literary figures from the

Soviet Union arrived in New York for a three-week visit. They came on the invitation of Taylor and the project was under the sponsorship of the Institute of Soviet-American Relations. The Soviet "literary" figures received generous amounts of publicity in the American press as they achieved a propaganda coup, talking about all the alleged good and great changes taking place in the Soviet Union's literary world.

As a leftwing pacifist, Taylor has mastered the clichés which the ban-the-bomb inveighers use against war, the military-industrial complex, the nuclear holocaust, and the arms race. As early as 1961, Taylor called for unilateral disarmament by the United States. His rationale: "The Russians will be forced to join us. Otherwise, world opinion would turn against them."

In 1964, Taylor joined poet and novelist Lenore Marshall to write "Peace, War, and Disarmament" for *Social Education's* October issue. The article was described as "a student guide to issues of war and peace." It was all a puff for the merits of disarmament, accommodation with Communist powers, and the United Nations ("the first genuine parliament of mankind"). Among the gems in the Taylor-Marshall piece was: "Although we oppose Communist dictatorship as a substitute for democratic reforms, revolution is in some cases the only way in which democracy could ever be achieved in South America." (In other words, there are times when a Communist revolution is necessary. Such pragmatism is characteristic of Taylor who has pontificated: "There is no absolute standard of good which can apply to every human act.")

There have been times when Taylor's public statements have had all the appearances of a deliberate spoof. Unfortunately, however, the weight of repetitious evidence is that Taylor is serious – for example, when he completed a five-month trip to the Soviet Union and Asia in 1961, he proposed that the United States should help to establish a new socialist state and economy in Southeast Asia. He explained: "[Socialism is] the only hope Asia has of combatting wracking population pressures. Backing its development with full technical and economic aid now would keep Asia free and stymie Soviet influence." In other words, sweeten the coffee by pouring salt into it.

Taylor's original fame, however, was based on his flair for "experimental education." How extreme could be his experiments was demonstrated in an address he delivered in 1963 to a meeting of the American Civil Liberties Union. He called for a revolutionary change in educational practices so that there would be a strong emphasis on the study of creative arts. He argued that the most powerful elements in society for shaping the future were not the technologists, engineers, or scientists, but rather the poets, writers, and critics. As a self-anointed spokesman for the entire educationist establishment, Taylor said: "We would allow a little bit of science, mathematics, engineering, law and other things, and these could be added as electives if there were any time, since they are frills."

To the same ACLU audience, Taylor showed his versatility as a leftwing propagandist. He described the attacks (real and alleged) on Buddhists in South Vietnam as being *directly related* to the bombing of Negroes in their churches in the South. And, since no address to an ACLU gathering would be really complete without a hatchet-job against anti-Communists, Taylor said: "Their concerns are not for the preservation of democratic values. They are defined by their hatreds, their fears, their anti-intellectualism, their anti-democracy."

HOWARD THURMAN was born on November 18, 1900 in Daytona Beach, Florida, son of Alice Ambrose and Saul Thurman. He married Sue Bailey. He is an alumnus of Morehouse College (A.B., 1923), Rochester Theological Seminary (B.D., 1926), and Wesleyan College (D.D., 1946). In 1925, he was ordained to the ministry of the Baptist Church. He is the author of *The Greatest of These* (1945); *Deep River* (1946 and 1955); *Meditations for Apostles of Sensitiveness* (1947); *The Negro Spiritual Speaks of Life and Death* (1947); *Jesus and the Disinherited* (1948); *Deep is the Hunger* (1951); *Meditations of the Heart* (1953); *The Creative Encounter* (1954); *Apostles of Sensitiveness* (1956); *The Growing Edge* (1956); *Footprints of a Dream* (1959); *The Inward Journey* (1961); *Temptations of Jesus* (1962); *Disciplines of the Spirit* (1963); *The Luminous Darkness* (1965); and *The Centering Moment* (1969).

From 1926 until 1928, Thurman was pastor of the Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Oberlin, Ohio. From 1928 until 1931, he was professor of religion at Morehouse College. From 1932 until 1944, he was professor of systematic theology and dean of chapel at Howard University. From 1944 until 1953, he was pastor at the Church for Fellowship of All Peoples in San Francisco. From 1953 until 1965, he was at Boston University: as professor of spiritual disciplines (1953-1965); dean of Marsh Chapel (1953-1964); emeritus dean (1964); and university minister (1964-1965). He has been a visiting lecturer at Earlham College, the Presbyterian Theological Seminary in Louisville, Harvard University, Ohio Wesleyan University, Tufts University, Bangor Theological Seminary, the Pacific School of Religion, Southwestern University, DePauw University, Nebraska Wesleyan University, and the University of Hawaii.

Thurman has been a long-time sponsor of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been a member and official of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists. He has been a long-time member of the leftist-pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation. He has been a member of the American Civil Liberties Union, that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness. He is a life member of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead for Negro agitation for more than half a century. He has been a sponsor for the militant racist Congress of Racial Equality. In the 1950's, he was affiliated with the Federation for Repeal of the Levering Act, which required loyalty oaths of those within the educational system of California. He joined other leftists in sending greetings to the Bandung Asia-Africa Conference, an international Communist operation. He joined other leftists in petitioning for cessation of H-bomb tests, and in urging that the anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima be a "day of repentance" for the American people.

DONALD HARVEY TIPPETT was born on March 15, 1896 in Central City, Colorado, son of Louise Magor and William Tippett. He married Ruth Underwood. He is an alumnus of the University of Colorado (A.B., 1920), Iliff School of Theology in Colorado (B.D., 1924; D.D., 1930), and New York University (M.A., 1932). He was ordained to the ministry of the Methodist

Church in 1919. He is the author of *Voices of Yesterday Speak to Today* (1940); *The Desires of a Godly Man* (1941); *The Desires of a Religious Man* (1942); and *Toward a Responsible Ministry* (1961).

From 1919 until 1927, he held various Methodist pastorates in Colorado. From 1928 until 1931, he was pastor of the Church of All Nations in New York City. From 1931 until 1940, he was pastor of Bexley Church in Columbus, Ohio. From 1940 until 1948, he was pastor of the First Methodist Church in Los Angeles, California. Since 1948, he has been bishop of the Methodist Church in the San Francisco area. He has lectured at the University of Colorado; Western State College of Colorado; Teachers College of Columbia University; the University of Southern California; Southern Methodist University; Emory University; Scarritt College in Tennessee; and Vanderbilt University. He has been active in the Methodist General Conference and the National Council of Churches. In 1967 and 1968, he was president of the Methodist Council of Bishops.

Tippett has been affiliated with American Youth for Democracy ("subversive and Communist"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); Churchman Associates (a leftwing group in support of *The Churchman,* edited by the late pro-Soviet propagandist, Guy Emery Shipler); *Protestant Digest* ("the Communist Party line under the guise of being a religious journal"); the Conference on the Impact of the Radical Right (anti-anti-Communist); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation. Tippett's statement in defense of Communist Jack McMichael was quoted in the Communists' *People's World.* Tippett petitioned President Eisenhower to ban nuclear bomb testing.

FRANK N. TRAGER was born on October 9, 1905 in New York City, son of Eda Shapiro and Benjamin Trager. He married Helen Gilbson. He is an alumnus of New York University (B.S., 1927; A.M., 1928; Ph.D., 1951). From 1928 until 1931, he was a graduate scholar at Johns Hopkins University. He is the author of *Building a Welfare State in Burma* (1954-1958); *Furnivall of Burma: An Annotated Bibliography of the Works of John S. Furnivall* (1963); *Why Viet Nam?* (1966); and *Burma from Kingdom to Republic: A Historical and Political Analysis* (1966). He is editor of *Annotated Bibliography of Burma* (1956) and *Japanese and Chinese Language Sources on Burma: An Annotated Bibliography* (1957). He is editor and co-author of *Burma's Role in the United Nations, 1948-1955* (1956); *Burma* (3 volumes in 1956); and *Marxism in Southeast Asia* (1959).

From 1928 until 1934, Trager was a philosophy instructor at Johns Hopkins University. In 1935 and 1936, he worked in the New Deal's Resettlement Administration. In 1936 and 1937, he was national labor secretary for the Socialist Party of the United States. From 1938 until 1943, he was program director for the American Jewish Committee; in 1945 and 1946, an assistant to the president of the National Conference of Christians and Jews; and from 1946 until 1951, program director of the defamatory Anti-Defamation League. From 1951 until 1953, he was director of the Agency for International Development mission in Rangoon, Burma. Since 1953, he has been on the faculty of New

York University, first as research professor and administrator (1953-1958), and since 1958, as professor of international affairs.

In 1953 and 1954, Trager held a fellowship at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Center for International Studies, a front of the Central Intelligence Agency. In 1957 and 1958, he was a Carnegie Research fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Between 1954 and 1958, his *Building a Welfare State in Burma* and *Burma's Role in the United Nations* were published under the auspices of the Institute of Pacific Relations. (In 1952, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee completed its extensive hearings on the IPR and reported that the IPR had been "a vehicle used by the Communists to orientate American far eastern policies toward Communist objectives" and an "instrument of Communist policy, propaganda and military intelligence." After 1952, there was no noticeable change in the complexion of the IPR, although its influence had been considerably reduced, due to the SISS hearings and report.)

Trager has lectured at Yale University, the National War College, the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute, and at the war colleges of the Army and Navy. He has been associated with various "think tanks" and "strategy" centers, including Rand Corporation, the Hudson Institute, the National Strategy Information Center, the Foreign Policy Research Institute, Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, and the Historical Evaluation and Research Organization in Washington, D.C.

Trager has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He has been affiliated with Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent. As a member and an officer, he has had a long-time association with the socialist League for Industrial Democracy.

With the publication of his *Why Vietnam?* in 1966, Trager achieved a great deal of national attention from doves and hawks and from supporters and opponents of the Johnson Administration's policy in the Vietnam war. He steered a careful course between the doves and the hawks. He talked firmly against Communism, but at the same time he advocated a no-win policy in Vietnam and wherever else the United States confronted Communists. He felt that if Communists were discouraged by force in Vietnam and elsewhere, they would be more or less obliged to settle for the *status quo* and the prospects of a third world-wide conflagration would be diminished. His optimistic appraisal that the Communists would be dissuaded from future aggression by limited action placed him on the side of the doves in the Johnson Administration. At the same time, he conceded that peace in Southeast Asia would only be achieved if the United States took decisive action "to put out the fires whenever and wherever they occur and also take steps to prevent fires from starting," as long as the major Communist powers were not excited enough by such action to wage all-out war.

MORRIS UDALL was born on June 15, 1922 in St. Johns, Arizona, son of Louise Lee and Levi Udall. He was married to and divorced from Patricia Emery. His second wife is Ella Royston. He is an alumnus of the University of Arizona (LL.B., 1949). He is the author of *Arizona Law of Evidence* (1960) and co-author of *The Job of the Congressman* (1966).

From 1949 until 1961, Udall practiced law in Tucson. From 1950 until 1952, he was chief deputy of the county attorney of Pima County, and in 1953 and 1954, he was county attorney. In 1955 and 1956, he was a lecturer on labor law at the University of Arizona. In 1956, he was chairman of Arizona Volunteers for Adlai Stevenson.

In 1961, Udall was elected to Congress, filling a vacancy left by his brother Stewart, who resigned to become Secretary of the Interior in the Kennedy Administration. Since 1961, Morris Udall has remained in the House of Representatives.

As a Congressman, Udall has been a faithful hack of the Democratic Left. He voted the straight New Frontier-Great Society line, showing special enthusiasm for Kennedy's Alliance for Progress and Johnson's War on Poverty. Early in his congressional career, he became a leader in the Democratic Study Group, a strong force behind the socialistic legislation of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations and guided by Walter Reuther and his successors' Committee on Political Education (COPE). He is a firm believer in the Keynesian theory that government should regulate the economy, and he is especially committed to the idea that the government should use its taxing power as a regulatory, rather than revenue-raising, device. For example, in 1968, he insisted that increased taxes should be the means of fighting inflation. His commitment to statism was most evident in 1966, when he recommended that a four per cent corporate income tax (a "moderate" increase, he called it) be imposed as "a temporary defense emergency tax" and that the President be given standby power to restrict installment credit if he deemed such action necessary. In the timeworn tradition of the liberal, Udall seeks to solve revenue problems by resorting to taxes rather than by seeking means of reducing expenditures.

In recent years, Udall has been quite vocal on most major foreign policy issues, and he has invariably followed the liberal internationalist line, embellished with his own contributions, which often border on hysteria. During the 1969 debates on the anti-ballistic missile system, he observed gloomily that "it is awful to realize that we could be playing at one of the final acts in our nation's history – indeed, the history of what we know as modern civilization." The same sense of doom has been evident when Udall talked of other matters. In 1967, while he prattled about the glories of an Atlantic Union, he said: "In place of the old balance of power – more recently known as the balance of terror – we would supply a federal union of nations so powerful that arms races would no longer make sense." In 1969, population control, according to Udall, was "one of the world's most severe problems." But as a dedicated statist, in the United States he considered population control a government problem – ideally, he thought, two children to a family was enough. (Ironically, he was one of six children and is the father of six.)

On the Vietnam War, Udall has been completely on the side of the doves. In the manner of Senators Edward Kennedy, George McGovern, and J. William Fulbright, Udall has been at war with the South Vietnam regime and the U.S. Department of Defense. He has completely misrepresented the military effort of the Americans and their allies in Vietnam. He has resorted to the usual liberal clichés: the Vietnam War is "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time." – "What in the scheme of things makes that patch of real estate in South Vietnam worth thousands upon thousands of American lives and billions upon billions of American dollars?"

After 1967, it became increasingly difficult to view Udall's foreign policy opinions seriously. At the conclusion of the absolutely futile and unproductive "summit" meeting of President Lyndon Johnson and Soviet Premier Aleksei Kosygin in New Jersey, Udall gushed: "I venture to say that history will weigh Glassboro as one of the major accomplishments of the Johnson Administration." Udall's evaluation was that Johnson had found Kosygin "an extremely rigid, but sensible man." In turn, he said, Kosygin had found Johnson "an extremely dynamic, flexible, persuasive, and sensible man."

MARK VAN DOREN was born on June 13, 1894 in Hope, Illinois, son of Dora Butz and Charles Van Doren. He married Dorothy Graffe. He is an alumnus of the University of Illinois (A.B., 1914; M.A., 1915) and Columbia University (Ph.D., 1920). His writings include about twenty volumes of poetry; several plays; several juvenile works; numerous short stories, novels, biographies, and anthologies; and his autobiography.

From 1920 until 1959, Van Doren was at Columbia University: as instructor in English (1920-1924); assistant professor (1924-1935); associate professor (1935-1942); and professor (1942-1959). From 1924 until 1928, he was literary editor of the radical *Nation* magazine, and from 1935 until 1938 was motion picture critic for the same publication. From 1937 until 1957, he was a visiting lecturer at St. John's College in Maryland. He was a visiting professor at Harvard University in 1963.

Van Doren has had a remarkable list of affiliations, which include the American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia ("Communist front"); the American Student Union ("Communist front"); the Freedom from Fear Committee ("Communist front"); the National Student League (long financed by the CIA); the Morris Schappes Defense Committee ("Communist" – "a front organization with a strictly Communist objective, namely, the defense of a self-admitted Communist who was convicted of perjury in the courts of New York"); the American Committee for Spanish Freedom ("Communist"); the Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("subversive" – Communist front"); the Jewish Blackbook Committee ("Communist front"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); *Soviet Russia Today* ("Communist front publication"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda"); the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby"); the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee ("subversive and Communist"); the Committee of One Thousand ("Communist created and controlled front organization"); the American-Russian Institute ("subversive" – "Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the Commitee of 102 Writers and Artists (an appeal on behalf of the Chilean Communist Pablo Neruda); the Committee of Welcome for the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson (a tribute to England's leading Red clergyman); the Society for the Prevention of World War III (leftwing-pacifist); the American Committee on Africa (leftwing); Churchman Associates (leftwing group in support of pro-Soviet propaganda); the Civil Defense Letter Committee (leftwing-pacifist); groups working for the presidential candidacy of Henry A. Wallace, patsy for the Communists: Educators for Wallace, Progressive Citizens of America, Writers for Wallace, National Wallace for President Committee, and New York State Wallace for President Committee; the Norman Thomas Eightieth Birthday Anniversary Committee (tribute to the patriarch of the Socialist Party); the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy (leftwing-pacifist); the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee ("to lead and direct the Communist Party's 'Operation Abolition' campaign"); the Atlantic Union Committee (leftwing-globalist); the Appeal to Guard Civil Rights against Encroachments of Anti-Communist Legislation (leftwing); the Appeal for Public Protest against "Violations of the Right to Free Opinion" (leftwing); the Appeal to Stop the Spread of Nuclear Weapons (leftwing-pacifist); the Christmas Appeal for Parole of the Hollywood Eight [Ten] (on behalf of film personalities convicted for contempt of Congress); In Defense of the Right to Speak for Peace (leftwing-pacifist); and Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility (an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation). Van Doren has signed a public statement approving employment of Communists as teachers. He was an organizer of the leftwing-one world United World Federalists and is still a member of UWF's national advisory board.

HENRY VAN DUSEN was born on December 11, 1897 in Philadelphia, son of Katharine Pitney and George Van Dusen. He married Elizabeth Bartholomew. He is an alumnus of Princeton University (A.B., 1919), Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1924), and the University of Edinburgh (Ph.D., 1932). In 1924, he was ordained to the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. He is the author of *In Quest of Life's Meaning* (1926 and 1930); *The Plain Man Seeks for God* (1933); *God in These Times* (1935); *For the Healing of the Nations* (1940); *Reality and Religion* (1940); *Methodism's World Mission* (1940); *What Is the Church Doing?* (1943); *East Indies Discoveries* (1944); *They Found the Church There* (1945); *World Christianity: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow* (1947); *God in Education* (1951); *Life's Meaning* (1951); *Spirit, Son and Father* (1958); *One Great Ground of Hope* (1961); *The Vindication of Liberal Theology* (1963); and *Dag Hammarskjold* (1967). He is the editor of *The Spiritual Legacy of John Foster Dulles* (1960).

From 1926 until 1963, Van Dusen was at the interdenominational Union Theological Seminary: as instructor (1926-1928); assistant professor of systematic theology and the philosophy of religion (1928-1931); associate professor (1931-1936); professor of systematic theology (1936-1963); dean of students (1931-1939); and president (1945-1963). (Union Theological Seminary, during Van Dusen's years as a faculty member and president, was saturated with Communists and fellow travelers. The Red nature of the seminary was due mostly to the influence of Harry Ward, a minister, a highly disciplined Communist, and a professor of Christian Ethics at Union from 1918 until 1943.) From 1945 until 1963, Van Dusen was also affiliated with the Presbyterians' Auburn Theological Seminary (which became associated with Union in 1939) as president of the faculty and, since 1961, as professor of Christian theology.

Aside from his duties at Union and Auburn, Van Dusen has had a long history of leftwing activism. He has been affiliated with the Fellowship of Socialist Christians; the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); and the National Religion and Labor Foundation ("Communist front"). He was signatory to numerous petitions to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He has been very active in the Red-saturated Federal Council of Churches. He has held executive positions in the strongly leftist-oriented National Council of Churches and World Council of Churches. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations. He has served on the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, two socialist bulwarks; has been a trustee of Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent; has been associated with the ultra-leftwing-pacifist Church Peace Union; and has been a trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation's socialist-oriented General Education Board.

ROBERT VAUGHN was born on November 22, 1932 in New York City, son of Marcella and Walter Vaughn. He attended the University of Minnesota for one year. He is an alumnus of Los Angeles State College (B.S. in Theatre Arts, c. 1955; M.A. in Theatre Arts, 1960). For many years he has been a doctoral candidate in communications at the University of Southern California. (His dissertation has been reported as "A Historical Study of the Influence of Sen. Joseph McCarthy on the American Theater.")

In the mid-1950's, Vaughn began an acting career in motion pictures, the stage, and television.

In the 1960's, Vaughn began a career in leftwing politics. Through his fame as an actor, he was able to meet in person with his political heroes, Robert F. Kennedy, George McGovern, Eugene McCarthy, J. William Fulbright, Vance Hartke, and Wayne Morse. He campaigned for Pierre Salinger in California's U.S. Senate race in 1964. He became chairman of the Speakers Bureau of the Democratic State Central Committee of California. His speeches on behalf of Democrats attracted the favorable attention of Hubert Humphrey and Edmund G. (Pat) Brown.

By the mid-1960's, Vaughn became one of the most widely quoted "experts" on the Vietnam War. He spoke at political gatherings and on campuses, including the University of Notre Dame, the University of Arkansas, and Harvard University. He made public appearances with his friend Martin L. King Jr., who was promulgating the line that the Vietnam War was a racist effort on the part of the United States and that war expenditures were depriving American Negroes of their welfare benefits.

Vaughn was one of the first prominent Democrats to make an all-out attack upon Lyndon Johnson's policy in Vietnam. Vaughn called for cessation of U.S. bombing; he described Ho chi Minh as fighting a war of liberation; he insisted that the Viet Cong should have a share in any South Vietnamese coalition government; and he accused the United States of seeking territorial influence in Asia.

Vaughn, whose undergraduate and graduate studies were in the theatre arts and who lacked any military experience, pontificated at length on military strategy and tactics, on history, on diplomacy, and on ideologies. But invariably his observations were merely an anthology of platitudes uttered by a long procession of peaceniks and anti-anti-Communists.

One of Vaughn's favorite projects has been the advocacy of U.S. diplomatic recognition of Red China. In 1966, after he had long urged recognition, he sought a scholar's visa to visit Red China to "stay there a month just out of curiosity. I'm interested in discovering the Chinese attitudes and policies regarding the United States." (Vaughn's ignorance of Red China was never better exemplified than in a speech he delivered at Harvard University in 1967 when he talked about Red China's genocidal rape of Tibet: "China, after ten years of patience and prudence, forced Tibet to suspend that dissatisfactory practice [of slavery] and observe national law. Bloodshed was held at a minimum, contrary to popular propaganda." Mao Tse-tung could not have improved upon that exercise in apologetics.)

In 1967, Vaughn became national chairman of Dissenting Democrats, a group of anti-Lyndon Johnson peaceniks who concentrated their attention upon the Vietnam War. In 1968, Dissenting Democrats became Coalition for a Democratic Alternative, concerned with the promotion of Eugene McCarthy's presidential aspirations and the candidacies of peaceniks across the country.

JAMES J. WADSWORTH was born on June 12, 1905 in Groveland, New York, son of Alice Hay and James Wadsworth. He was married to the late Harty Tilton. His second wife is Mary Donaldson. He is an alumnus of Yale University (B.A., 1927). He is the author of *The Price of Peace* (1961) and *The Glass House* (1966). He contributed to Arthur Larson's *A Warless World* (1963) and Alan Westin's *Power and Order* (1964).

From 1931 until 1941, Wadsworth was a Republican member of the New York State Legislature. From 1941 until 1945, he was an assistant manager for industrial relations in the Curtiss Wright Corporation. In 1945 and 1946, he was director of the public service division of the War Assets Administration. From 1946 until 1948, he was director of the government affairs department of the Air Transport Association of America. From 1948 until 1950, he was a special assistant to the administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration. In 1950, he was the acting director of the Office of Civil Defense, and in 1951, was the deputy administrator of the federal government's Civil Defense Administration.

From 1953 until 1961, Wadsworth was a United States Ambassador to the United Nations. From 1953 until 1960, he was deputy to Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, head of the U.S. mission, and in 1960 and 1961, served as head of the mission. (In his syndicated column of December 26, 1958, Holmes Alexander named Wadsworth as "the State Department's official hand-washer in the affair" of Bang-Jensen. Povle Bang-

Jensen, a Danish diplomat, had clashed with Soviet agents, Soviet stooges, and the Central Intelligence Agency during the course of his work at the United Nations. He was assassinated, presumably by Soviet goons, in 1959. Previously, his character had been assassinated by members of the U.S. mission to the United Nations.) Since Wadsworth left his post at the United Nations, he has been an active propagandist for the organization through the leftist United States Committee for the UN, the American Association for the UN, and the United Nations Association of the United States.

From 1965 until 1969, Wadsworth was a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

In 1961, Wadsworth was chairman of the board of trustees of Freedom House, a curious collection of liberals, Socialists, do-gooders, Communist fronters, and an occasional innocent. During his tenure as chairman, Freedom House gave its annual award to the German Socialist Willy Brandt, then the mayor of Berlin.

In 1961 and 1962, Wadsworth was the founding president of the Peace Research Institute (now the Institute for Policy Studies), one of the most prestigious organizations in the entire left-wing peace movement. Wadsworth has been a sponsor of the leftist-pacifist National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. He has been a member of the national advisory board of the leftist-internationalist United World Federalists, and in 1964, he received the UWF's Award for his promotion of peace and disarmament. He has been a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

O[SCAR] WALTER WAGNER was born on November 24, 1903 in Arlington Heights, Illinois, son of Johanna Meyer and Herman Wagner. He was married to the late Dorothy Hollinger. He is married to Dorothy Hetlage. He is an alumnus of Elmhurst College (A.B., 1928) and Chicago Theological Seminary (B.D., 1931). He also pursued graduate studies at the University of Chicago. In 1930, he was ordained to the ministry of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. He is the author of *The Man Without the Hoe* (1943); *What Labor Expects of the Churches* (1945); *The Common Man's Claim to Christianity* (1946); *Must We Misrepresent Europe's Miseries* (1950); *The Either-Or Fallacy* (1950); *Far East: Friend or Foe* (1954); *Germany: Guilty or Good* (1955); *Israel: Land of Promise* (1956); *Levels of Brotherhood* (1964); and *Brotherhood in an Apartment-Size World* (1964).

From 1928 until 1948, Wagner served pastorates in Gary, Indiana; Loudonville, Ohio; and Jackson, Michigan. In 1948, he was press correspondent for the World Council of Churches. In 1948 and 1949, he was on the staff of World Service of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Since 1950, he has been executive director of the Metropolitan Church Federation of St. Louis. He has made study tours of West Germany, Israel, the Middle East, Africa, and the Soviet Union.

Wagner has been affiliated with the Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder ("Communist"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front"); the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("subversive and Communist" – "under [Communist] Party domination and headed by responsible Party functionaries"); the *Protestant* ("Communist front"); the United World Federalists (leftwing, pacifist); the St. Louis Council of World Affairs (leftwing, globalist); the American Civil Liberties Union (that motley collection of defenders of subversion, crime, and licentiousness); the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (fountainhead of Negro agitation for more than half a century); and the Southern Conference Educational Fund (the financial backbone of racial agitators, including "black power" revolutionaries).

WILLIAM J. WALLS was born on May 8, 1885 in Rutherford, North Carolina, son of Hattie Edgerton and Edward Walls. He married Dorothy Jordon. He is an alumnus of Livingstone College of North Carolina (A.B., 1908; B.D., 1913).

From 1905 until 1920, he served as minister to African Methodist Episcopal Zion churches in Cleveland, Lincolnton, and Salisbury in North Carolina, and in Louisville, Kentucky. From 1920 until 1924, he was editor of the *Star of Zion* in Charlotte, North Carolina. From 1924 until 1955, he was a bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church of America and he has been senior bishop of the Church since 1955. He has been a high official in the World Methodist Conference and the National Council of Churches.

Walls' affiliations have included the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born [Americans] ("subversive and Communist" – "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" – under the "complete domination" of the Communist Party); the Bill of Rights Conference ("subversive"); the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact ("a Communist front" – "part of Soviet psychological warfare against the United States"); the Civil Rights Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Mid-Century Conference for Peace ("aimed at assembling as many gullible persons as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast sounding board for Communist propaganda" – "a Communist front"); the leftwing Nation Associates; the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill ("a Communist lobby"); the National Committee to Repeal the McCarran Act ("a Communist front" – "subversive"); the National Committee to Win Amnesty for Smith Act Victims ("subversive"); the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship ("subversive and Communist" – "specializing in pro-Soviet propaganda"); the National Council of the Arts, Sciences and Professions ("a Communist front used to appeal to special occupational groups"); the National Negro Congress ("subversive and Communist"); the Peace Information Center ("Communist front"); the World Peace Appeal ("subversive"); and the Council on African Affairs ("subversive and Communist"). He endorsed the political candidacy of Benjamin J. Davis, a Communist Party leader. He appealed for amnesty to be granted convicted and imprisoned Communist Party leaders. He was also affiliated with various leftwing and racist agitating groups including: the African Aid Committee, the American Crusade to End Lynching, the National Committee to Defend Negro Leadership, and the Southern Conference Educational Fund. For many years, he has been a high official of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the fountainhead of Negro agitation for the past fifty-eight years.

FREDERICK M. WARBURG was born on October 14, 1897 in New York City, son of Frieda Schiff and Felix

Warburg. He married Wilma Shannon. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1919).

From 1919 until 1921, Warburg was associated with American International Corporation. In 1921 and 1922, he was with M.M. Warburg and Company in Hamburg, Germany. From 1922 until 1927, he was with Kuhn, Loeb & Company. From 1927 until 1930, he was with Lehman Brothers. Since 1931, he has been a partner in Kuhn, Loeb & Company, an international power in political, diplomatic, and financial affairs.

Warburg has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He is on the national council of the leftist-internationalist Foreign Policy Association. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that the Communist Party hailed its formation.

ABBOTT WASHBURN was born on March 1, 1915 in Duluth, Minnesota, son of Ruby Frisk and Abbott Washburn. He was married to and divorced from Mary Brennan. His second wife is Wanda Allender. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (B.S., 1937).

From 1937 until 1952, Washburn managed the department of public services for General Mills, Incorporated. In 1952, he organized the national headquarters of Citizens for Eisenhower and served as the corresponding secretary for presidential candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower. In 1953, he was on the White House staff as executive secretary to the President's Committee on International Information Activities. From 1954 until 1961, he was deputy director of the United States Information Agency. In 1961 and 1962, he was a vice president in the public relations firm of Carl Byoir and Associates. Since 1962, he has been president of Washburn-Stringer Associates, a public relations firm.

From 1950 until 1952, he was executive vice chairman of Crusade for Freedom (National Committee for a Free Europe), now known as Radio Free Europe, a financial dependent of the Central Intelligence Agency. He is a long-time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has been a board member of the leftist-internationalist Federal Union. He has served on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. Currently, he is deputy director of the Citizens Committee for Peace with Freedom in Vietnam, which since 1967 has issued wordy statements that support the no-win policy in the Vietnam War as pursued by the Johnson and Nixon Administrations.

ARTHUR K. WATSON was born on April 23, 1919 in Summit, New Jersey, son of Jeanette Kittredge and Thomas Watson. He married Ann Hemingway. He is an alumnus of Yale University (A.B., 1942).

In 1947, Watson joined International Business Machines (founded by his father) as a salesman. Two years later, he became vice president of the newly-formed IBM World Trade Corporation, and since 1963, has been chairman of the board.

Watson belongs to that curious group of American industrial tycoons who insist that it is good business to do business with Communist bloc nations whose leaders, as adherents of Marxism-

Leninism, are dedicated to the overthrow of the free enterprise system which made the founding and development of such corporations as IBM possible. Watson has often employed a slogan devised by his father: "World peace through world trade." As a practical application of the slogan, Watson has sold IBM's sophisticated computers to Communist Czecho-Slovakia, Communist Hungary, Communist Poland, and Communist Bulgaria at the very time these nations were sending aid to North Vietnam in its war effort against the United States. Watson has also operated on the basis that "commerce can transmit ideas from people to people rather than from government to government." In fact, however, when Watson trades with Communist nations, the relationship is between IBM and the government leaders of the Communist regime, and the idea behind the deal is that Communist regimes are able to perpetuate themselves by obtaining equipment such as that developed by IBM and other American companies.

Watson has traveled in Republican circles with his close friends Richard M. Nixon and Nelson Rockefeller. In 1959, he visited Moscow with Nixon and engaged in highly publicized discussions with former Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, in which Watson promoted the merits of IBM's products. In 1969, Watson traveled throughout Latin America with Rockefeller on a mission that, unsurprisingly, recommended an increase in American-financed socialism to "solve" the economic and sociological tribulations of Latin American countries, which were being worsened by the Alliance for Progress.

In an effort to promote freer trade between the United States and the Communist bloc, Watson has founded the Emergency Committee for American Trade – in effect, a boost for the "building-bridges-to-the-East" policy propounded by Lyndon Johnson's Administration.

Watson has served on The Advertising Council's public policy committee which serves to promote pet projects in the statist domestic and the internationalist foreign policies of the federal government. He has served as a director of the leftist-pacifist Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. He is a non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has served on the board of directors of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle.

JAMES WECHSLER was born on October 31, 1915 in New York City, son of Anna Weisberger and Samuel Wechsler. He married Nancy Fraenkel. He is an alumnus of Columbia University (A.B., 1935). He is the author of *Revolt on the Campus* (1935); *Labor Baron* (1944); *The Age of Suspicion* (1953); and *Reflection of an Angry Middle-Aged Editor* (1960). He is co-author (with Joseph P. Lash) of *War, Our Heritage* (1937) and (with Harold Lavine) *War Propaganda and the United States* (1940).

From 1935 until 1937, Wechsler was employed by the American Student Union ("a Communist front" – "subversive and un-American"), and he was editor of the ASU's *Student Advocate.* From 1938 until 1940, he was assistant editor of *Nation* magazine. In 1940 and 1941, he was labor editor of *PM,* a leftist newspaper, and from 1942 until 1945 he was PM's bureau chief in Washington. In 1945, he spent about six months in the U.S. Army. Since 1946, he has been with the *New York Post:* as Washington correspondent (1946-1949), editor (1949-1961), and since 1961, columnist and editorial page editor. In the late 1940's, he was a Washington correspondent for the *New York Post.*

In 1953, Wechsler testified before the Permanent Senate Subcommittee on Investigations. He admitted that from 1934 until 1937 he had been a member of the Young Communist League. He admitted that *Revolt on the Campus* and *War, Our Heritage* were written in conformity with the Communist line. He insisted, under oath, that after 1937 he was a vigorous and effective anti-Communist, with absolutely no sympathy for Communism. He has denied under oath that he was ever a member of the Communist Party. His denial has not been refuted. Since 1947, when he was a founder of Americans for Democratic Action, Wechsler has been a member of ADA. He is also a long-time member of the American Civil Liberties Union.

As a columnist, editor, and political gadabout, Wechsler has been persistently left-of-center since his days at Columbia, when he was a leader of the socialist Student League for Industrial Democracy. His columns and editorial page are a reflection of his long-time commitment to the extremism of the ADA and ACLU programs. He has been in the forefront of critics who charge that the Federal Bureau of Investigation and all anti-subversive congressional investigating committees seriously endanger the rights and the liberties of all Americans. Under the banner of his self-proclaimed libertarianism, Wechsler attacks the "fascists," a term of opprobrium which, in the context of his prolific output, applies to all who are anywhere to the right of his ideological position.

HERMAN B. WELLS was born on June 7, 1902 in Jamestown, Indiana, son of Anna Harting and Joseph Wells. He is an alumnus of Indiana University (B.S., 1924; A.M., 1927). In 1927 and 1928, he pursued graduate studies at the University of Wisconsin.

In 1927 and 1928, Wells was an assistant in the department of economics at the University of Wisconsin. From 1928 until 1931, he was field secretary for the Indiana Bankers Association. From 1931 until 1968, he was at Indiana University: as instructor in economics (1931-1933); assistant professor (1933-1935); professor and dean of the School of Business Administration (1935-1937); acting president (1937-1938); president (1938-1962); and chancellor (1962-1968). Since 1962, he has been chairman of the Aerospace Research Applications Center at Indiana University.

Wells has held a variety of appointive positions with the federal government. In 1944, he was a special advisor on liberated areas for the Department of State. In 1945, he was a consultant to the U.S. delegation at the founding conference of the United Nations. In 1946, with the rank of U.S. minister, he was in Greece observing elections for the Allied Missions. In 1947 and 1948, he was a cultural affairs advisor to the U.S. military government in Germany. In 1957, he was a U.S. delegate to the United Nations General Assembly. In 1960, he headed a U.S. delegation to the SEATO preparatory commission on university problems. In 1960 and 1961, he was a member of a committee of experts reviewing activities and the organization of the United Nations secretariat. In 1965, he was a member of the President's Committee on United States-Soviet Trade Relations. From 1951 until

1957, he was on the governing board of the Red-dominated UNESCO Institute for Education.

Wells is a long-time non-resident member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He has served on the council of the leftist-internationalist Atlantic Union Committee and the International Movement for Atlantic Union. He has served on the national council of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He has been chairman of the board of the leftist-internationalist Education and World Affairs. He has been a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations in the work of socializing the American economy. He has been a trustee of the socialist-oriented Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching; a director of the leftist-oriented National Educational Television and Radio Center; and a director of the leftist-internationalist People-to-People, Incorporated.

WALTER H. WHEELER JR. was born on February 21, 1897 in New York City, son of Charlotte Dutton and Walter Wheeler. He was married to the late Florence Chilton. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1918).

Since 1919, Wheeler has been with Pitney-Bowes Inc.: as salesman (1919-1922), European representative (1922), branch manager (1923-1924), general manager (1924-1931), vice president (1931-1938), president (1938-1960), chairman of the board (1960-1969), and since 1969, chairman of the executive committee.

Wheeler has been a long-time member of the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. Since 1937, he has been a member of the Business Advisory Council, the CFR's patronage link to the federal government. He has been a high official of the Foreign Policy Association, a highly effective pro-Communist vehicle. He has been a director of the World Affairs Council, a pivotal agency in a complex of one-world, leftist, and pacifist groups, serving as a major propaganda arm for the United Nations. He has been a director of the leftist-internationalist United Nations Association of the United States. He has been a trustee of the Committee for Economic Development, the major propaganda arm of the Council on Foreign Relations in the work of socializing the American economy. He has been an advisor to the statist Office of Economic Opportunity, and an official of the leftist-pacifist Council on World Tensions.

GILBERT F. WHITE was born on November 26, 1911 in Chicago, son of Mary Guthrie and Arthur White. He married Anne Underwood. He is an alumnus of the University of Chicago (B.S., 1932; M.S., 1934; Ph.D., 1942).

From 1934 until 1940, White was a geographer with the New Deal's Public Works Administration, the National Resources Board, the National Resources Committee, and the National Resources Planning Board.

In 1941 and 1942, White was the principal legislative analyst of the United States Budget Bureau. From 1942 until 1944, he was in France doing relief work for the American Friends Service Committee. In 1945 and 1946, he was assistant executive secretary for the AFSC.

From 1946 until 1955, White was president of Haverford College. From

1956 until 1969, he was a geography professor at the University of Chicago. In 1970, he became a geography professor and the director of the Institute of Behavioral Science at the University of Colorado. (White has also lectured at American University and at Oxford University.)

From 1963 until 1969, White was chairman of the American Friends Service Committee. During his tenure, the AFSC made strong representations for the United States to recognize Red China and to support admission to United Nations membership for Red China. In the same period, the AFSC was as extreme in its opposition to the Vietnam War as any leftwing group in America. It condemned United States military strategy and tactics; it encouraged pro-Communist anti-Vietnam War demonstrations; it distributed advice to draft-age youths in order to swell the ranks of conscientious objectors; it intensified a long-lived program on behalf of unilateral disarmament; and in 1966, it donated money to purchase medical supplies for war victims in North and South Vietnam and in areas held by the Viet Cong.

Beyond his pacifist activities with the AFSC, White has also been affiliated with the left wing in the Committee for World Development and World Disarmament and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. He signed a petition to the United Nations calling for a total ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

White signed a friend-of-the-court brief on behalf of the Communist Party when the Party was involved in litigation with the Subversive Activities Control Board. He has been affiliated with the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States. He belonged to Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.

LLOYD WICKE was born on May 22, 1901 in Cleveland, son of Catherine Christ and John Wicke. He married Gertrude Allen. He is an alumnus of Baldwin-Wallace College (A.B., 1923) and Drew Theological Seminary (B.D., 1926; Ph.D., 1938). He also pursued graduate studies at New York University, Yale University, Columbia University, Syracuse University, and Union Theological Seminary, and was granted a doctor of divinity degree by Baldwin-Wallace College in 1941. He was ordained in 1926 to the ministry of the Methodist Church.

From 1926 until 1948, Wicke served ministries in Paterson, Lafayette, Alpine, and Leonia in New Jersey, and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. From 1948 until 1960, he was the resident Methodist bishop in the Pittsburgh area. Since 1960, he has been the resident Methodist bishop in the New York City area.

Wicke's affiliations have included the Methodist Federation for Social Action ("Communist front") and the Churchman Associates (a leftwing group in support of *The Churchman,* edited by the late pro-Soviet propagandist, Guy Emery Shipler). He petitioned the President of the United States to take executive action against the anti-Communist Internal Security Act and the Smith Act. He petitioned the President of the United States to extend clemency to Frank Wilkinson and Carl Braden, who had been convicted and imprisoned for contempt of Congress. He participated in the Harry Ward ninetieth birthday celebration, a tribute to one of America's all-time Communist leaders of clergymen. He was a member of Arthur Larson's National Council for Civic Responsibility, an anti-anti-Communist group which was so leftwing that its formation was hailed by the Communist Party.

ROBERT F. WILLIAMS was born on February 26, 1925 in Monroe, North Carolina. He is married. During the Korean War, he saw stateside service in the U.S. Marines but was discharged as a shirker. Prior to his marine service, he worked in Detroit as a freight handler and janitor. After his discharge, he returned to Detroit and worked as a machinist.

In 1955, Williams wrote to President Eisenhower and said that he wanted to renounce his American citizenship. A short time later, he sought permission from Soviet authorities to move to the Soviet Union. In neither case did Williams get what he wanted.

In 1955, Williams moved from Detroit and returned to his hometown of Monroe, North Carolina, where he joined a chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. He soon became president of the NAACP chapter and tried to convert it into an armed militant group. His activities embarrassed the NAACP's leaders, and for a brief time in 1959 he was suspended from his position.

In 1960, Williams became a founder of the Castro-financed Fair Play for Cuba Committee, and in that same year he visited Cuba several times. He met with officials of the Castro Government and granted radio and television interviews in which he praised the Communist regime.

On April 21, 1961, while the Bay of Pigs invasion was being debated at the United Nations, Williams sent a telegram to Raul Roa, then the Cuban foreign minister. In the telegram, which Roa read to the General Assembly, Williams said: "Now that the United States has proclaimed military support for people willing to rebel against oppression, oppressed Negroes in the South urgently request tanks, artillery, arms, money, use of American airfields and white mercenaries to crush the racist tyrants who have betrayed the American Revolution and the Civil War. We also request prayers for this noble undertaking."

In August 1961, in the aftermath of a racial riot in Monroe, Williams was charged with kidnapping and interstate flight. (An FBI "wanted" circular said that Williams had "previously been classified as schizophrenic and has advocated and threatened violence . . . [and] should be considered armed and extremely dangerous.")

(In a letter to the Communists' *National Guardian* in 1961, Williams wrote that a white couple was "captured, disarmed [they were not armed] and placed under citizens' arrest by a group of Negroes." But Williams claimed that he asked the group to release the couple, which they did. Then the couple disappeared. About the time Williams' letter appeared in print, the Monroe Defense Committee was formed to raise money and public support for Williams and four cohorts who were involved in the kidnapping. The committee included Communists William Albertson, Herbert Aptheker, William Epton, Carl Marzani, Jesse Gray, Cyril Phillips, and Victor Perlo, and such well-known leftwingers as Mr. and Mrs. Ossie Davis [Ruby Dee], Nat Hentoff, Abraham J. Muste, and Lyle Stuart. Despite the efforts of the Monroe Defense Committee, Williams' companions were convicted in 1964 in

North Carolina on the kidnapping charges. North Carolina's Supreme Court overthrew the conviction because there were no Negroes on the grand jury which brought in the indictment. The four and Williams were indicted by a new jury, but they jumped bail.)

When Williams fled from Monroe, he went to Cuba by way of New York City, Montreal, and Mexico City. He sought asylum in the Soviet Union but was refused. He then settled for asylum in Cuba.

In 1961 and 1962, Williams broadcasted a program, Radio Free Dixie, from Havana over the 50,000-watt Radio Progreso. Every Friday night, for one hour, Williams spewed out anti-American propaganda directed at American Negroes with the intention of inciting racial strife in the United States. By 1963, the broadcasts were aired three times weekly.

From Cuba, in addition to his radio broadcasts, Williams propagandized American Negroes through a newsletter, *The Crusader,* which he began issuing in June 1958 on a rather irregular schedule. (In Cuba, Williams was on the payroll of Castro's regime. He also received money through the offices of the Canadian Fair Play for Cuba Committee.)

In September 1963, Williams interrupted his sojourn to visit Red China, where he was virtually lionized. From China, he sent a message to President Kennedy in which he claimed that there was a "savage persecution of American Negroes by U.S. racists." Williams warned Kennedy: "Let me remind you that these heathen racist crimes against black humanity shall be avenged!"

A month before Williams arrived in China, the Communist leader Mao Tse-tung had issued a statement at Williams' request, "calling upon the people of the world to unite to oppose racial discrimination by U.S. imperialism and support the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination." Mao's statement was duly printed in a special edition of *The Crusader* and Williams could not have asked for a stronger endorsement for Negro revolution. Said Mao: "I wish to take this opportunity, on behalf of the Chinese people, to express our resolute support for the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination and for freedom and equal rights . . . . The fascist atrocities committed by the U.S. imperialists against the Negro people have laid bare the true nature of the so-called democracy and freedom in the United States and revealed the inner link between the reactionary policies pursued by the U.S. Government at home and its policies of aggression abroad. I call upon the workers, peasants, revolutionary intellectuals, enlightened elements of the bourgeoisie and other enlightened personages of all colours in the world, white, black, yellow, brown, etc., to unite to oppose the racial discrimination practiced by U.S. imperialism and to support the American Negroes in their struggle against racial discrimination."

Three years after Mao's statement was made, Williams celebrated the anniversary with an effusive tribute that was printed in the *Peking Review* (August 12, 1966). Williams gave Mao credit for giving "impetus to a floundering and feeble movement of armed self-defence. And today all of the reactionary world is shocked and terrified by the turbulent winds of ever increasing armed resistance now sweeping the mighty fortress of savage imperialism and beastly racism. In racist America's mighty northern cities, in the small towns, in the countryside, in the dark and deep jungle wilderness of the southland, from coast to coast oppressed and de-humanized black people are meeting oppressive racist terrorist's violence with revolutionary violence. The thunder of Black Power echoes throughout the land. A mighty firestorm sweeps through the black ghettoes rife with rebellion. In their paradise of stolen wealth, ringed by massive arsenals of horrible death weapons, the tyrannical kings of imperialism tremble from the terrifying shock of a confrontation with wretched and angry slaves, armed with a common household match and a bottle of gasoline."

To Williams, Mao was "our great leader and teacher, the architect of people's warfare." And directing his remarks to the people in Red China, Williams said: " . . . We revolutionary Afro-Americans vow that we shall take the torch of freedom and justice into the streets of racist America and we shall set the last great stronghold of Yankee imperialism ablaze with our battle cry of Black Power! Freedom! Freedom! Freedom now or Death! For our people, for our country and for our compatriots throughout the world, we shall reclaim the nobility of the American Revolution. We shall raise our flag in honor, true peace and brotherhood to all the world.

"Long live the People's Republic of China!

"Long live Chairman Mao Tse-tung!

"Long live the people's resistance to imperialism, racism, and tyranny!

"Long live the militant friendship between the Chinese and revolutionary American people!"

Upon his return to Cuba after his first visit to Red China, Williams in the pages of *The Crusader* became obsessed with terrorism as he exhorted American Negroes to adopt wholesale violence. Page after page of *The Crusader* served as a manual for terrorism: "The weapons of defense employed by Afro-American freedom fighters must consist of a poor man's arsenal. Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails), lye or acid bombs (made by injecting lye or acid in the metal end of light bulbs) can be used extensively. During the night hours such weapons, thrown from the roof tops, will make the streets impossible for racist cops to patrol. Hand grenades, bazookas, light mortars, rocket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen anxious to make a fast dollar. Freedom fighters in military camps can be contacted to give instruction on usage.

"Extensive sabotage is possible. Gas tanks on public vehicles can be choked up with sand. Sugar is also highly effective in gasoline lines. Long nails driven through boards and tacks with large heads are effective to slow the movement of traffic on congested roads at night. This can cause havoc on turnpikes. Derailing of trains causes panic. Explosive booby traps on police telephone boxes can be employed. High-powered sniper rifles are readily available. Armor-piercing bullets will penetrate oil storage tanks from a distance. Phosphorous matches (kitchen matches) placed in air conditioning systems will cause delayed explosions which will destroy expensive buildings. Flame throwers can be manufactured at home. Combat experienced exservicemen can easily solve that problem."

On another occasion, Williams called for Afro-Americans to develop an organization which would incorporate "legal" armed defense guards, an underground guerrilla force, a welfare corps, and – most important – a sabotage force. Williams, evidently realizing that he was treading on dangerous ground when he advocated sabotage, pleaded: "Let me pause here to stress that it is not my endeavor to violently overturn the U.S. Government *per se* but to struggle uncompromisingly to abolish the evil it condones and engenders. It is not my intent to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government but to explore its weaknesses, to destroy its myth of invincibility and to advance the study of the potential of a minority revolution."

Williams' denials notwithstanding, the methodology he advocated "to explore its weaknesses" was nothing less than barbaric: "The most aggressive and irrepressible arm of the overall [Afro-American] organization would be the fire teams. They would work in complete secrecy and would be totally divorced in the organizational sense from the main bodies of defense and other forces. They would enjoy complete autonomy . . . . The fire teams' mission would be sabotage. Thousands of these groups would be organized throughout racist America. These teams would consist of from three to four persons. They would only know the members of their immediate team. They would not identify with the civil rights movement. They would appear to be apathetic and even Uncle Toms. They would sometimes masquerade as super patriots, and be more than willing in a deceptive way, to cooperate with the police. They would even infiltrate the police force and armed forces when possible . . . .

"The mission of these thousands of active fire teams would be setting strategic fires. They could render America's cities and countryside impotent. They could travel from city to city placing lighted candles covered by large paper bags in America's forests, and have time to be far removed from the scene by the time the lighted candle burned to the dried leaves. While unsparingly setting the torch to everything that would burn in the cities, and while concentrating on urban guerrilla warfare, the rural countryside would not be neglected. Aside from the devastating damage that could be visited upon the countryside, such a mission could serve a twofold purpose: It would also divert enemy forces from the urban centers. State forces would be forced to spread their ranks and would not be able to sustain massive troop concentrations in a single community. The heat and smoke generated from the fires would render some of the highways impassable to repressive troop reinforcements.

"The rural countryside covers vast areas and would require exhaustive manpower, equipment and security forces. America cannot afford to allow its rich timber resources and crops to go up in smoke. The fire teams roving in automobiles would find unguarded rural objectives even more accessible. A few teams could start miles and miles of fires from one city to the other. The psychological impact would be tremendous. By day the billowing smoke would be seen for miles. By night the entire sky would reflect reddish flames that would elicit panic and a feeling of impending doom. Operating in teams of twos or threes, one freedom fighter could pour gasoline or lighter fluid from a small flask into public waste paper baskets, another could later enter and toss a lighted cigarette in the same container. Near closing time kitchen matches could be placed in the air conditioning systems of industrial and public buildings. The property of racists would be designated as priority objectives. Through this method, the racist oppressors could be reduced to poverty in a short span of time.

"These fire teams could also go on pre-dawn missions just before the morning rush for work. Their objective would be to spread tacks fitted with wire bases to insure their upright position when thrown from a moving automobile in heavily travelled tunnels and freeways. Pure havoc would ensue. Sugar or sand in gas tanks could be used to knock out the engines of public vehicles. During police invasions of the ghetto, lye and acid bombs could be thrown from roof tops. Many forms of booby traps could be utilized."

There is no doubt that Williams' explicit instructions on sabotage and terrorism were directed towards the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), organized in 1963. Williams, from the beginning, was RAM's Chairman-in-Exile. (On a visit to Hanoi, North Vietnam, in 1964, Williams said: "As a representative of the Revolutionary Action Movement, I am here to give support to the Vietnamese people in their struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression.")

In March 1965, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified that RAM was "a highly militant, secretive organization following the Chinese oriented Marxist-Leninist line and believes in replacing the capitalistic system with socialism." Mr. Hoover continued: "Although no timetable is known, RAM allegedly has its program organized into three stages, the first one being education and recruitment. The second stage is one of expropriation whereby efforts will be made to secure sufficient funds for the organization. This will include robbery and other means, legal or illegal. The third stage will be one of direct action whereby the present system of government will be replaced by RAM's Chinese-oriented society, to be accomplished by any means available."

Just a month before Mr. Hoover made his observations, members of RAM were arrested in a plot to bomb the Statue of Liberty, the Liberty Bell, and the Washington Monument. In June 1967, RAM members were arrested in a plot to assassinate U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy and Negro leaders Roy Wilkins and Whitney Young Jr. In September 1967, two RAM plots were uncovered. In the first, RAM members were arrested when it was discovered that they planned a mass poisoning of Philadelphia policemen. In the second, RAM members planned to assassinate President Lyndon Johnson, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and Philadelphia's district attorney, mayor, and police commissioner.

Meanwhile, RAM's Chairman-in-Exile was having his difficulties. In the Spring of 1966, Williams moved from Cuba to Red China. He claimed that he had become disillusioned with the Castro regime: promises had been broken; there was interference with his propaganda efforts; but most of all, he had encountered racial discrimination. In the August 1966 issue of *Peking Review*, Williams complained about his Cuban experience: "We Afro-American revolutionaries have discovered that some so-called socialists, we thought to be our comrades and class brothers, have joined the international Ku Klux Klan fraternity for white supremacy world domination. To our consternation, we have discovered that the bourgeois-oriented power structure of some socialist states, even one with a black and white population, would prefer to preserve the white reactionary anti-communist power structure of racist America, their natural enemy, than to see a just, democratic fraternal socialist state brought about by the revolutionary action of oppressed blacks that would serve the best interests of all people of all races."

Williams' move to Red China did not mean that he was forsaking his revolutionary ambitions for the United States. In Peking, he continued to publish *The Crusader* wherein he wrote: "The most noble cry to come out of racist America since the Boston Tea Party is the cry: *Burn, Baby, Burn.* It is a good starter for more than just fires. It is a point of origin for a mighty revolutionary process . . . . Yes, *Burn, Baby, Burn,* like the Boston Tea Party, is a good point of origin but in the final analysis the brutal oppressor must go and the cry *Kill, Baby, Kill* must prevail." He called upon his Afro-American followers to "try the new sensational, black power cocktail. Mix the best! Gasoline, a little burnt motor oil and a dash of petroleum jelly. Catches on like napalm. Shake well before serving."

In 1968, while in Red China, Williams was elected President of the Republic of New Africa. The RNA, organized in March 1968, was an echo of a Communist scheme of the 1920's and 30's to recruit Negroes. The RNA alleged that Negroes were not voluntary citizens of the United States; their citizenship had been forced upon them. Therefore, Negroes deserved a separate republic which would include Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, and South Carolina, and perhaps Florida and North Carolina. The several states would either be negotiated away from the United States government or taken by any means necessary. To compensate for the enslavement of Negroes, the United States would be expected to give the RNA $400 billion and all the gold in Fort Knox. An elaborate hierarchy of officials was constructed, the most important individual being the RNA's first vice-president, Milton Henry, a Detroit attorney.

In May 1968, while on a mission for his Red Chinese bosses to Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania, Williams met with Milton Henry. (Williams went to Tanzania on an alien travel document issued by Red China. But before he left Tanzania on his return trip, an official of the U.S. Embassy in Dar-es-Salaam obligingly gave him an American passport.)

In the summer of 1969, Williams published his last issue of *The Crusader* in Peking and announced the impending end of his exile. He left Red China under the friendliest of circumstances and took up residence in Tanzania. (Columnist Paul Scott reported that Williams met Stokely Carmichael – the American Negro agitator – during this period. According to Scott, the two men agreed to join forces to organize a new international revolutionary black movement with Communist backing. Carmichael would remain in Africa where he organized a sanctuary for American black militants, while Williams would work in the United States to unite all black militant groups into one organization. According to their grandiose scheme, Williams and Carmichael would work to restore President Kwame Nkrumah to power in Ghana, where they hoped their American black militants would have an operational base. Ghana would become a training and staging area where Red Chinese, Soviet, and Cuban instructors would train a guerrilla army that would be used to establish the Republic of New Africa in the United States.)

In September 1969, Williams decided to return to the United States and end his eight-year exile. He flew from Tanzania to London, by way of Cairo. In London, Williams was unable to book passage to the United States on a regular commercial flight. But under State Department pressure, Trans World Airlines flew Williams from London to Detroit, at its own expense, under highly unusual circumstances: A Boeing 707 jet (manned by a pilot, copilot, flight engineer, two stewardesses, two pursers, a TWA executive, and two TWA security guards) carried Williams and his attorney, Milton Henry, as the only passengers. As the two boarded the plane in London they posed for cameramen by giving the Communists' clenched-fist salute. When Williams arrived in Detroit, he was wearing a Mao Tse-tung ensemble of suit and hat. He was greeted ceremoniously by his followers and officially by agents of the FBI.

Three hours after his arrival in Detroit, Williams was released from federal custody on a $10,000 personal recognizance bond. He then held a press conference. The *Washington Post* described him as "homesick." The *New York Times* called him "a soft-voiced prophet of militance." In general, Williams' return from exile was treated reverently by the leftwing press, as though it were the return of the prodigal son in the Bible. But there were a few who remembered that it was Williams who had called upon American Negro soldiers in Vietnam to kill white American soldiers "so that these racists will not be able to return home."

CHARLES E. WYZANSKI JR. was born on May 27, 1906 in Boston, Massachusetts, son of Maude Joseph and Charles Wyzanski. He married Gisela Warburg. He is an alumnus of Harvard University (A.B., 1927; LL.B., 1930). In 1931, he was admitted to the Massachusetts bar. Intermittently, from 1931 until 1941, he was engaged in private law practice.

In 1930 and 1931, Wyzanski was a law secretary for federal circuit court justice Augustus Hand, and in 1932, he was a law secretary for federal circuit court justice Learned Hand. From 1933 until 1935, he was a solicitor for the Department of Labor. In 1935, he was a United States representative to the Red-dominated International Labor Organization. From 1935 until 1937, he was a special assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. In 1941, he was a member of the National Defense Mediation Board.

In December 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed Wyzanski to be a federal district judge in Massachusetts. (Wyzanski became chief judge of the federal district court of Massachusetts in 1965.)

Wyzanski has never found his judicial duties so onerous as to preclude him either from engaging in activities beyond the courtroom or from making controversial statements on matters not in the purview of his court.

In 1942 and 1943, and in 1949 and 1950, Wyzanski was a lecturer on government at Harvard University. From 1948 until 1950, he was a visiting professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In 1949 and 1950, he was a copyright expert at the Paris and Washington meetings of the Communist-saturated UNESCO. From 1945 until 1955, he was a member of the committee on application conventions for the Red-dominated International Labor Organization. He has been a nonresident member of the leftist-internationalist Council on Foreign Relations. He has been an executive committeeman and trustee of the Ford Foundation, which has financed socialist projects around the world.

When Alger Hiss was on trial for perjury in connection with his Communist activities, Wyzanski testified on two separate occasions before two courts as to the good character and reliability of Hiss.

On December 5, 1950, the Communists' *Daily Worker* recorded Wyzanski as joining in a call to President Truman to withdraw American forces from Korea and the U.S. Seventh Fleet from Formosan waters and for U.S. support of Red China's admission to United Nations membership.

In August 1951, the Communists' *Masses and Mainstream* quoted Wyzanski's objections to a Supreme Court decision upholding the anti-subversive Smith Act, under which Communist Party leaders were convicted and imprisoned.

From 1953 until 1957, Wyzanski was president of Harvard University's board of overseers. During his tenure, J. Robert Oppenheimer was appointed to Harvard's faculty as a guest lecturer on ethics and philosophy. Two years before the appointment was made, a special federal loyalty board had ruled that Oppenheimer was a security risk. Wyzanski, nevertheless, approved and defended the appointment, even though the "security risk" label adhered to Oppenheimer for the rest of his life. (From 1958 until 1963, Wyzanski was on the board of trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study: "security risk" Oppenheimer was, at that time, Director of the Institute.)

In 1969, Wyzanski reaped a harvest of headlines nation-wide when he decided that the Selective Service Act of 1967 "unconstitutionally discriminated against atheists, agnostics, and men who are motivated by profound moral beliefs which constitute the central convictions of their beings." As he overthrew tradition and overruled the drafting of non-religious conscientious objectors, Wyzanski admitted that the nature of the Vietnam War affected his thinking, but he insisted that his decision was not a judgment of the war. (Earlier, Wyzanski used the prestige of the federal bench to rule that school authorities violated the "rights" of a high school student when they expelled the youth for affecting a long-hair style, contrary to the regulations of the school.)

CHARLES W. YOST was born on November 6, 1907 in Watertown, New York, son of Gertrude Cooper and Nicholas Yost. He married Irena Oldakowaska. He is an alumnus of Princeton University. In 1928 and 1929, he pursued graduate studies at the University of Paris.

Between December 1930 and August 1933, Yost was in the U.S. diplomatic service as a vice consul in Alexandria and in Warsaw, and attended the foreign service school for six months. He resigned from the service, and from 1933 until 1935 he was a free-lance journalist. (He apparently spent most of this period in Europe, but his various biographical notices in commercial and governmental publications do not indicate either the extent of his travels or where his free-lance journalism appeared.)

In 1935, Yost resumed his career in the State Department – a career that would be uninterrupted until 1966. During the thirty-one year period he held an impressive variety of positions: he was a division assistant in the State Department (1935); assistant chief in the Division of Arms and Munitions Control (1935-1941); an assistant chief in the Division of Special Research (1942); an assistant chief in the Division of European Affairs (1942-1943); an assistant chief in the Division of Foreign Activity Correlation (1943-1944); an executive secretary to the State Department's Policy Committee (1944-1945); secretary general of the U.S. delegation to the Berlin Conference (1945); policy adviser to the Commanding General of the India-Burma Theater (1945); chargé d'affaires at Bangkok (1946); second secretary (later first secretary) and consul at Prague (1946); political adviser to the U.S. delegation at the United Nations General Assembly (1946); first secretary and consul (later counselor of the legation) at Vienna (1947-1949); special assistant to the Ambassador-at-Large to the Council of Foreign Ministers and to the Ambassador-at-Large to the United Nations General Assembly (1949); director of the Office of East European Affairs (1949-1950); counselor, with the personal rank of minister, in Athens (1950-1953); deputy high commissioner for Austria and deputy chief of the U.S. mission in Vienna (1952-1954); minister, later ambassador, to Laos (1954-1956); counselor, later minister-counselor, at Paris (1956-1957); ambassador to Syria (1957-1958); member of the Policy Planning Staff at the State Department (1958). He was appointed career minister in 1958 and served as ambassador to Morocco from 1958 to 1961. Between 1961 and 1966, he was deputy representative, alternate representative, and representative of the United States, with the personal rank of ambassador, to the UN General Assembly.

Yost's bewildering array of positions, some held for only a few weeks or months, produced one of the most ultra-liberal leftists in contemporary American diplomacy. It was only fitting that in 1966 he became a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, the informal supra-State Department of the United States.

On December 20, 1968, President-elect Richard Nixon announced that he was nominating Yost to be the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Nixon described this as "probably one of the best appointments I have made." Nixon then elaborated: "I think there have been times when the role of ambassador to the UN was better filled by a political personage with a world reputation. It is my belief that at this particular time we need the kind of ambassador Mr. Yost will be: a highly skilled negotiator, a man who knows the UN and is deeply dedicated to seeing it strengthened."

The Left Liberal Establishment greeted the news of Yost's appointment with both astonishment and unrestrained glee. On the other hand, conservatives who were familiar with Yost's past were dismayed at his return to diplomacy.

Four months before he was named by President-elect Nixon, Yost appeared before a Congressional panel which was holding hearings on proposals for the Democrat Party's platform for the 1968 presidential campaign. Yost, who was to become a chief foreign policy adviser to the Democrat's presidential candidate, Hubert Humphrey, presented his prospectus for U.S. foreign policy for 1969-1973. It was Yost's contention that U.S. policy had not kept pace with the changes on the international scene since the decade following World War II.

Yost saw six major changes: "(1) The Soviet Union is militarily more powerful but politically weaker and more vulnerable – deeply at odds with [Red] China, trying at all costs to maintain its dominion over Eastern Europe, but more cautious and less aggressive outside its own bloc; (2) our Western European allies are economically stronger but militarily and politically less united and less willing to undertake responsibilities outside Europe; (3) [Red] China is as hostile as ever but is so disorganized internally that it is not a major immediate threat to us or its neighbors; (4) the political and economic expectations of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have risen vastly but, in the absence of development sufficiently rapid to meet these expectations, the peoples concerned are deeply frustrated; in many cases they are likely to resort to internal or external violence which will have repercussions outside their own regions; (5) the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. can destroy each other but cannot unilaterally control recalcitrant or turbulent small nations; (6) the chief threat to international and U.S. security is not, at least in the near future, Communist aggression but (a) the costly, dangerous and needless nuclear arms race and (b) uncontrolled turbulence in Asia, Africa, and Latin America sucking in and contraposing great powers."

Yost urged that the United States begin a determined and persistent effort "to freeze and then to reduce arsenals of offensive and defensive missiles and other nuclear weapons." Without offering a bit of evidence, he conjectured that "the Soviets may now be prepared to negotiate seriously on this subject." On the basis of nothing more than this "may be," Yost said that the United States should unilaterally "restrict major new programs for a reasonable time while negotiations are pursued."

Toward Europe, Yost – surprisingly enough – urged a hands-off policy for the United States. If European unity were achieved, he expected that it would result from European, rather than outside, efforts. In the meantime, he recognized that "inside Europe détente has been interrupted by the brutal invasion of Czecho-Slovakia, though this is an internally defensive rather than an externally aggressive action." Mercifully, he did not attempt to explain how a brutal *invasion* could ever be construed as an *internally defensive action.*

Yost predicted "considerable turbulence in Asia, Africa and Latin America." He more or less discounted the idea that the United States could either ignore the turbulence or act against it unilaterally. His solution was for the United States to cooperate with "the only effective multilateral instrument" – the United Nations. He conceded that the UN's "peacekeeping" efforts required the Soviet Union's acquiescence. Therefore, the United States and other permanent members of the UN's security council should work to persuade the Soviets to cooperate for peace in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Naturally, Yost did not hint that the turbulence on those three continents was due in great measure to the Soviets' talent for subversion.

On the matter of the perpetual Arab-Israeli conflict, Yost could do no better than drag out the hoary proposal that members of the UN's Security Council, including the United States, should work harder to resolve the conflict.

For the Vietnam War, Yost wanted a "compromise settlement." As might have been expected, the compromise would be one-sided: the United States would suspend all bombing of North Vietnam and the United States would offer the National Liberation Front an opportunity to participate fully in the political life of South Vietnam.

Yost wanted to see more generous handouts to the nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America from the United States, and he was especially anxious that the handouts be channeled through the offices of the United Nations and other international institutions.

Yost was particularly anxious that the United States make "vigorous and meaningful efforts" to bring back Red China into the international community. (When Red China ever was in the international community, Yost neglected to say.)

Yost's position on Red China was probably the least surprising facet of his proposals for a U.S. foreign policy. In 1949, he was an important contributor to the State Department's nefarious White Paper on China – a document which, in effect, expressed United States acquiescence in the takeover of the mainland by the Red Chinese. In 1967, Yost joined such prominent Red China lobbyists in the United Nations Association as Doak Barnett, Jacob Potofsky, Arthur Dean, and Anna Lord Strauss in an endorsement of Red China's admission of the UN and membership on the UN's Security Council after a "probationary" period. On another occasion, Yost said: "She [Red China] should be invited without delay, and without regard for her current disorders, into the United Nations, and into all other appropriate international organizations. Initially, she will no doubt refuse; she will prove, when she does come in, a most prickly and disruptive partner . . . . The stakes in this case, however, are too high to permit or excuse boggling by the rest of the world . . . . Both [Red] China's sobriety and its friendship are essential to world order." On still another occasion, Yost complained that the "absence of Communist China, North Vietnam and North Korea inhibits the United Nations from undertaking a peace-keeping role in Asia." Of course, Yost did not mention that the three "inhibitors" had waged and were waging contemporary wars of aggression, none yet settled, at an enormous cost in lives and casualties to American and allied combat forces.

Of all the appointive positions at President Nixon's command, none was more appropriate for Yost than the ambassadorship to the United Nations. Not only has Yost been a staunch booster and apologist for the UN, but also his position there serves as a highly advantageous platform for the dissemination of his anti-nationalism and proglobalism.

Writing in *Foreign Affairs* ("The United Nations: Crisis of Confidence and Will") in January 1966, Yost heaped praises on the UN's effective peacekeeping at Suez (one of Liberaldom's favorite canards), expressed the conviction that the Soviet Union believed in the UN as a peacekeeping force (one of Liberaldom's favorite idiocies), and advocated a U.S. foreign policy committed to sponsoring the UN as the world's peacekeeping force (a mere paraphrase of a Liberaldom cliché: "The UN is man's best and last hope for peace."). In this promotional piece, Yost gave the UN credit for mobilizing an army against North Korean aggression – a complete distortion of history. He had strong words to say against South Africa, which has incurred the wrath of the UN to such an extent that the Liberals have actually blueprinted a UN invasion of that nation. And he called for the funneling of U.S. economic handouts through the UN and its agencies.

In a book published in 1967 (*The Insecurity of Nations*), Yost made an all-out plea for nations to submerge their national interests on behalf of all mankind: "The primary cause of the insecurity of nations persists – the very attribute on which nations pride themselves most – their sovereign independence, their 'sacred egoism,' their insubordination to any interest broader than their own . . . .

"There will never be security for nations and peoples until there exists some impartial and effective international authority expressing man's best instincts and common interests, designed and empowered to keep the peace, restrain aggressive governments, control national armaments, negotiate and enforce peaceful settlements, facilitate peaceful change, and assist new states to develop and modernize.

"The nature of the modern world is such that it will not tolerate a pax Romana, pax Britannica, pax Sovietica. or pax Americana. Peace-keeping, if it is not in practice to become war-making, is a task that henceforth has to be performed collectively."

Even after Yost was named to the UN post by President-elect Nixon, he continued to revile nationalism. In December 1968, in an address to the World Order Research Institute at Villanova University, he said: "I think we must work for the evolution of the nation state system into a world federal structure. It's time to move away from old slogans and clichés about national interests, national honor, and toward structures which will provide a really more rational and more sensible basis for a permanent world order . . . . "

Since Yost has been in the UN, he continues to use "old slogans and clichés" that have been worn thin since the days of Woodrow Wilson, through their use by such internationalists as Adlai Stevenson, Wendell Willkie, Norman Cousins, Arthur Larson, Eleanor Roosevelt, and J. William Fulbright. In June 1968, speaking to the General Synod of the United Church of Christ, Yost warned that "there are coming to be more and more actions of the greatest consequence which, if they are to be done safely or even done at all, must be done by international agreement and international action." He lamented the limitation of the UN's powers but thought there was hope for improvement: "All great powers, including the Soviet Union, are showing significant interest in developing a more reliable UN peacekeeping capacity, first of all for use in supporting a Middle Eastern settlement but clearly also to be available to deal with other situations which the members of the Security Council might agree constitute serious threats to international peace. There does now seem to be a reasonable hope that, as the risks and burdens of unilateral response to such threats become more obvious, there may be an increasing acceptance of the necessity of an effective multilateral alternative such as the UN could provide."

Yost was particularly sad over the fact that the UN – in this "interdependent" world – had not crushed the anti-Communist regime of Rhodesia with economic sanctions; nor did he think the anti-Communist regime of South Africa could be subjected by the UN until the UN became a peacekeeping juggernaut. However, such capabilities for the UN would, Yost surmised, be difficult of attainment until the absent "great powers" were UN members. He had named them previously: Red China and the Communists' North Korea and North Vietnam. And this is the man of whom President Nixon has said: "There's no question about his loyalty to this country and I also think there's no question about his very good judgment on critical issues confronting the United States."

INDEX OF ORGANIZATIONS

A Combined Listing For Volumes I And II

Advance (precursor of W.E.B. Dubois Clubs) II-181
Advance (publication of Republican Advance) II-159
Advertising Council II-1
American Association For The United Nations I-190
American Association Of University Professors II-11
American Civil Liberties Union I-1
American Committee For Protection Of Foreign Born II-38
American Friends Service Committee II-45
American Institute Of Pacific Relations I-116
Americans For Democratic Action I-17
Atlantic Council Of The United States I-63
Atlantic Institute I-63
Atlantic Treaty Organization I-63
Atlantic Union Committee I-63
Black Panthers II-56
Carnegie Corporation I-26
Carnegie Endowment For International Peace I-26
Carnegie Foundation For The Advancement Of Teaching I-26
Center For The Study Of Democratic Institutions I-85
Church Peace Mission I-74
Clergy And Laymen Concerned About Vietnam II-78
Collegiate Council For The United States I-190
Commission To Study The Organization Of Peace I-190
Committee On Atlantic Studies I-63
Committee On Political Education I-40
Conference Group Of U.S. National Organizations Of The United States I-191
Congress Of Racial Equality I-42
Council For A Livable World I-46
Council On Foreign Relations I-53
Councils For Protection Of Foreign Born II-38
Federal Union I-63
Fellowship Of Reconciliation I-74
Ford Foundation I-85

Foreign Affairs I-53
Foreign Policy Association I-106
Foreign Policy Bulletin I-106
Freedom And Union I-63
Freedom House I-112
Fund For Education In World Order II-97
Fund For Peace II-97
Fund For The Republic I-85
Great Decisions Programs I-106
Group Research, Inc. I-172
"Headline Series" I-106
Institute For American Democracy I-172
Institute Of Pacific Relations I-116
Intercollegiate Socialist Society I-124
Inter-Democracy Federal Unionists I-63
International Labor Defense II-38
International Movement For Atlantic Union I-63
International Red Aid II-38
International Relations Clubs I-106
League For Industrial Democracy I-124
League Of Political Education (AFL) I-40
Methodist Federation For Social Action II-105
Methodist Federation For Social Service II-105
National Association For The Advancement Of Colored People I-140
National Citizens Committee For UN Day I-190
National Committee For A Sane Nuclear Policy I-153
National Committee For An Effective Congress I-159
National Committee To Abolish The House Un-American Activities Committee I-167
National Convocation On The Challenge Of Building The Peace II-97
National Council Against Conscription I-74
National Council For Civic Responsibility I-172
National Education Association II-115
National Religion And Labor Foundation I-74
National Student Association II-145
Pierce Butler Jr. Foundation For Education In World Law II-97
Political Action Committee (CIO) I-40
Progressive Youth Organizing Committee II-181

Public Affairs Institute I-172
Republican Advance II-159
Republicans For Progress II-159
Ripon Society II-159
Roger Baldwin Foundation I-1
Social Questions Bulletin II-105
Social Service Bulletin II-105
Student League For Industrial Democracy I-124
Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee I-185
Students For A Democratic Society I-124
Turn Toward Peace I-74
United States National Student Association II-145
Union For Democratic Action I-17
United Nations Association Of The United States I-190
United States Committee For The United Nations I-190
United World Federalists I-195
UN We Believe I-190
Vista I-191
W.E.B. Dubois Clubs II-181
Women's International Strike For Peace II-190
Women Strike For Peace II-190
Workers Defense League I-74
World Affairs Center I-106
World Affairs Councils I-106
World Association of World Federalists I-195
Young Communist Liberation League II-181
Young Workers Liberation League II-181

INDEX OF BIOGRAPHIES

A Combined Listing For Volumes I And II

Abel, Iorwith Wilbur I-203
Abernathy, Ralph D. I-204
Abram, Morris II-203
Abt, John J. II-205
Acheson, Dean I-206
Achilles, Theodore II-207
Ackley, Gardner I-207
Aiken, George D. II-208
Akers, Anthony B. II-208
Alexander, Sadie T.M. II-209
Alinsky, Saul I-207
Allen, Donna I-208
Allen, George V. I-210
Allen, James E. Jr. II-209
Alsop, Joseph I-210
Alsop, Stewart I-211
Altschul, Frank I-211
Anderson, Clinton P. I-212
Anderson, Dillon II-211
Anderson, Hurst II-211
Anderson, Jack I-213
Archer, Glenn L. I-213
Armstrong, Hamilton Fish I-214
Arnold, Thurman I-215
Arnoni, Manachem S. I-216
Ascoli, Max I-216
Ashmore, Harry I-217
Attwood, William II-212
Baez, Joan II-214
Bailey, John M. I-218
Baldwin, James I-219
Baldwin, Roger I-220
Ball, George W. I-222
Bancroft, Harding II-216

Barghoorn, Frederick I-223
Barnes, Joseph I-223
Barnett, Doak I-224
Barnett, Robert I-225
Barr, Stringfellow I-226
Barth, Alan I-227
Barzun, Jacques II-219
Battle, Lucius I-228
Bayh, Birch I-228
Beam, Jacob I-229
Beebe, Frederick S. II-220
Beer, Samuel I-229
Beirne, Joseph I-230
Belafonte, Harry II-220
Belfrage, Cedric I-230
Bell, Daniel II-222
Bell, David I-232
Bennett, John C. I-232
Benton, William I-234
Berelson, Bernard R. II-224
Berle, Adolf A. Jr. I-236
Berman, Daniel M. II-224
Berrigan, Daniel II-225
Berrigan, Philip F. II-230
Bessie, Alvah I-237
Bethe, Hans A. I-238
Bevel, James I-240
Biberman, Herbert J. II-234
Bingham, Barry II-236
Bingham, Jonathan I-242
Bisson, Thomas A. I-243
Black, Algernon I-244
Black, Eugene I-245
Black, Hugo L. I-246
Blake, Eugene I-246
Blanding, Sarah Gibson II-237
Blanshard, Paul I-247
Block, Herbert I-248

Bodde, Derk I-249
Boggs, (Thomas) Hale II-237
Bohlen, Charles I-249
Bolte, Charles G. II-238
Bond, Julian II-239
Bosley, Harold A. II-242
Boudin, Kathy II-243
Boudin, Leonard B. II-245
Boulding, Kenneth E. II-248
Bowie, Robert R. II-250
Bowles, Chester I-250
Brameld, Theodore II-252
Bridges, Harry I-251
Brinkley, David I-252
Bronk, Detlev I-252
Brook, Edward W. I-254
Brown, Edmund G. (Pat) I-257
Brown, Harrison II-254
Brown, John A. Jr. II-255
Brown, John Mason II-256
Bruce, David I-258
Brzezinski, Zbigniew I-259
Bunche, Ralph I-260
Bundy, McGeorge I-262
Bundy, William I-263
Bunker, Ellsworth I-264
Burdick, Quentin II-256
Burkhardt, Frederick H. II-257
Burns, Arthur F. II-258
Burns, James MacGregor I-265
Burtt, Edwin A. II-260
Butler, Allan M. II-260
Buttenwieser, Benjamin J. II-262
Cabot, Henry B. II-263
Cabot, Thomas D. II-263
Cameron, (Donald) Angus I-265
Canfield, Cass II-263
Canham, Erwin I-267

Carey, James B. . . . I-268
Carmichael, Stokely . . . I-269
Carr, William George . . . I-272
Carter, Hodding . . . I-272
Case, Clifford . . . I-273
Celler, Emanuel . . . I-275
Cerf, Jay Henry . . . II-264
Charlesworth, James C. . . . II-265
Chayes, Abram . . . II-266
Childs, Marquis . . . I-276
Chisolm, Shirley . . . II-266
Chomsky, (Avram) Noam . . . II-268
Church, Frank . . . I-276
Cisler, Walker L. . . . II-268
Clark, Evans . . . II-269
Clark, Joseph S. . . . I-277
Clark, Ramsey . . . I-280
Cleaver, Eldridge . . . II-270
Cleveland, Harlan . . . I-281
Clinchy, Everett R. . . . II-277
Clubb, Oliver Edmund . . . I-282
Coffin, William S. Jr. . . . I-286
Cogen, Charles . . . II-278
Cogley, John . . . II-279
Cohelan, Jeffery . . . II-280
Cohen, Wilbur . . . I-289
Cole, Charles W. . . . II-282
Commager, Henry S. . . . I-290
Conant, James B. . . . II-282
Condon, Edward U. . . . I-291
Conyers, John Jr. . . . I-292
Cook, Fred . . . I-293
Cooper, John Sherman . . . I-294
Copland, Aaron . . . I-295
Cordier, Andrew . . . I-296
Coryell, Charles . . . II-286
Countryman, Verne . . . II-286
Counts, George S. . . . II-288

Cousins, Norman . . . I-297
Cowles, John . . . II-293
Cowley, Malcolm . . . II-294
Cox, Harvey . . . II-295
Cranston, Alan . . . II-297
Crockett, William J. . . . I-298
Currie, Lauchlin . . . I-298
Dahlberg, Edwin . . . I-301
Darrell, Norris . . . II-301
Da Silva, Howard . . . II-301
Dassin, Jules . . . II-302
Davidon, William C. . . . II-304
Davies, John Paton Jr. . . . I-302
Davis, Jerome . . . I-304
Davis, Ossie . . . II-305
Davis, Rennard C. . . . II-306
Day, Gardiner M. . . . II-310
Dean, Arthur . . . I-305
Dean, Vera Micheles . . . I-306
Dee, Ruby . . . II-310
De Lima, Oscar . . . II-311
Dellinger, David . . . II-312
Dennis, Donald P. . . . II-318
Dillon, (Clarence) Douglas . . . I-306
Donner, Frank . . . I-307
Donohue, F. Joseph . . . II-319
Douglas, Helen Gahagan . . . II-319
Douglas, Lewis W. . . . II-323
Douglas, Paul H. . . . II-323
Douglas, William O. . . . I-307
Dowd, Douglas . . . II-324
Dowling, Walter . . . II-325
Drekmeier, Charles . . . II-325
Dreyfus, Benjamin B. . . . II-326
Drinan, Robert F. . . . II-328
Drummond, Roscoe . . . I-308
Dubinsky, David . . . I-309
Dudley, Tilford . . . II-334

Duke, Angier Biddle I-310
Eaton, Cyrus I-310
Edel, Abraham II-335
Edwards, Don I-311
Eichelberger, Clark M. II-336
Eisendrath, Maurice N. II-338
Eisenhower, Milton I-313
Elegant, Robert I-314
Emeny, Brooks II-339
Emerson, Thomas I. I-315
Emmerson, John K. I-316
Engel, Irving M. II-340
Ethridge, Mark I-317
Evans, Luther II-340
Fadiman, Clifton II-341
Fairbank, John K. I-317
Farmer, James I-321
Feiffer, Jules I-322
Feld, Bernard T. II-342
Ferry, Wilbur H. (Ping) II-342
Field, George II-346
Field, Ruth Pruyn II-350
Finch, Robert H. II-350
Finkelstein, Lawrence S. II-352
Finletter, Thomas I-323
Fischer, Louis I-324
Fisher, Adrian I-325
Fleeson, Doris I-326
Fleming, Denna F. I-326
Flemming, Arthur I-327
Fletcher, Joseph F. I-329
Folsom, Marion I-330
Ford, Henry II I-330
Foreman, Clark H. II-353
Fortas, Abe I-331
Foster, William C. I-332
Fowler, Henry I-333
Frank, Jerome D. I-333

Frankel, Charles II-357
Franklin, George S. II-358
Franklin, H. Bruce II-359
Fraser, Donald II-360
Freeman, Harrop II-362
Freeman, Orville I-334
Friendly, Alfred I-335
Friendly, Fred W. II-363
Fritchey, Clayton I-336
Fromm, Erich I-336
Fuchs, Lawrence H. II-364
Fulbright, J. William I-337
Galbraith, John Kenneth I-339
Gallagher, Buell I-340
Gardner, John W. I-342
Gardner, Richard N. II-365
Garrison, Lloyd K. II-366
Garry, Charles R. II-367
Garwood, Wilmer St. John II-370
Gavin, James M. I-343
Geismar, Maxwell II-370
Gellhorn, Walter I-344
Genovese, Eugene II-371
Gideonse, Harry D. II-373
Gilder, George I-345
Gilpatric, Roswell I-346
Gittelsohn, Roland B. II-374
Glazer, Nathan II-376
Goheen, Robert I-347
Goldberg, Arthur I-348
Goldman, Eric II-377
Gonzalez, Henry B. II-379
Goodell, Charles E. II-380
Goodman, Paul II-383
Goodwin, Richard I-349
Gore, Albert II-385
Gould, Laurence M. II-388
Graham, Frank II-388

Greeley, Dana McLean II-390
Greene, Felix I-350
Griswold, Erwin I-352
Groppi, James E. II-391
Gross, Chaim II-395
Gross, Ernest I-353
Gruening, Ernest I-354
Guinier, Ewart G. II-395
Haber, William II-397
Halaby, Najeeb E. II-398
Hall, Jack W. I-355
Hammond, John II-400
Handlin, Oscar II-401
Harding, Ralph I-357
Harkness, Georgia II-402
Harriman, Averell I-358
Harrington, Donald I-359
Harrington, Michael I-360
Harris, Fred R. II-403
Harris, M(arquis) Lafayette II-404
Hartke, Vance I-361
Hatfield, Mark I-361
Hauge, Gabriel I-363
Havighurst, Robert J. I-364
Hawkins, Edler II-404
Hayden, Sterling II-405
Hayden, Thomas E. II-410
Hayes, Samuel P. II-415
Heald, Henry T. II-416
Heckscher, August I-365
Heinz, Henry II II-417
Hellman, Lillian II-417
Hentoff, Nathan II-419
Hersey, John II-421
Herter, Christian Jr. II-421
Hester, Hugh I-366
Hilsman, Roger I-367
Hoagland, Hudson II-422

Hoffman, Abbott (Abbie) II-423
Hoffman, Hallock II-425
Hoffman, Paul I-368
Holman, Halsted Reid II-425
Horn, Francis H. II-427
Houghton, Amory I-370
Howe, Harold II I-371
Howe, Quincy I-372
Hoyt, Palmer I-372
Hughes, Emmet I-372
Hughes, Harold E. II-427
Hughes, H. Stuart I-373
Hughes, Thomas L. II-428
Humphrey, Hubert I-374
Huntley, Chet I-375
Hurley, Ruby II-429
Hurok, Sol I-375
Hutchins, Robert M. I-376
Jack, Homer A. II-430
Jackson, Jesse II-430
Jacobs, Paul II-432
Javits, Jacob I-378
Jessup, Philip C. I-379
Johnson, Joseph E. I-380
Johnson, Lyndon B. I-381
Johnson, U. Alexis I-383
Jones, (Everett) LeRoi II-433
Jones, Howard Mumford I-384
Josephson, Matthew I-385
Julian, Percy II-435
Kalb, Marvin L. II-435
Kampelman, Max M. II-437
Kastenmeier, Robert W. I-386
Katz, Milton II-438
Katzenbach, Nicholas I-387
Kaysen, Carl II-438
Keating, Edward I-388
Kempton, (James) Murray II-439

Kennan, George F. I-390
Kennedy, Edward M. I-392
Kennedy, Gerald II-441
Kennedy, Robert F. I-393
Kenny, Robert W. I-395
Kerr, Clark I-397
Keyserling, Leon II-442
Killian, James R. Jr. I-399
King, Coretta II-443
King, Martin Luther I-400
Kinoy, Arthur II-445
Kintner, Robert I-401
Kirchwey, Freda I-402
Kirk, Grayson I-403
Kirkpatrick, Evron II-446
Kissinger, Henry I-403
Kistiakowsky, George B. II-447
Klutznick, Philip M. II-453
Knight, O.A. II-454
Kohler, Foy I-404
Kohn, Hans II-454
Komer, Robert W. I-406
Konvitz, Milton R. II-455
Kraft, Joseph I-407
Kuchel, Thomas I-408
Kunstler, William II-456
Lally, Francis J. II-458
Lamont, Corliss I-409
Lampell, Millard I-410
Langer, William L. II-459
Larson, Arthur I-412
Lash, Joseph P. I-414
Lasswell, Harold D. II-460
Lattimore, Owen I-415
Lehmann, Paul L. II-462
Lengyel, Emil I-417
Lens, Sidney I-418
Lerner, Max I-419

Lewis, Alfred Baker II-462
Lilienthal, David E. II-463
Lindsay, John V. II-464
Linowitz, Sol M. I-421
Lippmann, Walter I-422
Littell, Franklin I-423
Livingston, M. Stanley II-470
Lodge, George Cabot II-470
Lodge, Henry Cabot I-425
Loeb, James I-426
Loos, A(mandus) William II-472
Lord, John Wesley II-472
Lowenstein, Allard K. II-475
Lubin, Isador II-478
Lyford, Joseph P. II-480
Lynd, Helen Merrell I-427
Lynd, Robert S. I-428
Lynd, Staughton C. I-429
Lynn, Conrad J. II-483
MacDougall, Curtis D. II-484
MacLeish, Archibald I-431
Magnusen, Warren I-432
Mann, Thomas C. I-433
Mansfield, Michael J. I-433
Marcus, Stanley II-485
Marcuse, Herbert I-435
Marks, Leonard I-436
Marshall, Lenore G. II-486
Marshall, Thurgood I-437
Mather, Kirtley F. I-440
Mathias, Charles Jr. II-486
Matthews, Herbert I-441
Mays, Benjamin I-442
McCarthy, Eugene I-442
McCloy, John I-445
McGee, Gale I-447
McGill, Ralph I-448
McGovern, George I-449

McKeever, Porter II-488
McKissick, Floyd B. I-450
McNamara, Robert S. I-451
McWilliams, Carey I-452
Mead, Margaret I-454
Melman, Seymour I-454
Merchant, Livingston T. II-488
Metcalf, Lee I-455
Meyner, Robert B. II-489
Miller, Arthur I-456
Miller, Clyde I-457
Miller, J. Irwin II-489
Miller, Loren II-491
Miller, Uri II-492
Millikan, Max I-458
Millis, Walter I-459
Mitford, Jessica I-460
Mondale, Walter F. II-493
Moos, Malcolm II-496
Morgenthau, Hans I-462
Morse, Bradford II-497
Morse, Wayne L. I-463
Moscoso, Teodoro I-464
Mosely, Philip E. II-498
Mosk, (Morris) Stanley I-465
Moss, Frank I-465
Moynihan, Daniel I-466
Muelder, Walter G. II-499
Mueller, Reuben H. II-500
Mumford, Lewis I-467
Munk, Arthur W. II-501
Muskie, Edmund I-468
Nason, John W. II-501
Nathan, Robert R. II-502
Neal, Fred Warner I-469
Nearing, Scott I-471
Newfield, Jack I-503
Niebuhr, Reinhold I-472

Nielsen, Waldemar A. II-504
Nitze, Paul I-473
Obenhaus, Victor II-505
Osgood, Charles I-473
Overstreet, Harry I-475
Pastore, John O. II-506
Patton, James G. I-477
Pearson, Drew I-478
Peck, Sidney M. II-507
Pell, Claiborne II-508
Pepper, Claude I-479
Percy, Charles H. I-483
Perkins, James A. II-512
Peterson, Esther II-513
Plimpton, Calvin H. II-515
Plimpton, Francis T.P. II-516
Porter, Paul A. II-516
Potofsky, Jacob S. I-484
Powell, Adam Clayton Jr. II-517
Price, Charles C. II-522
Prinz, Joachim II-522
Proxmire, William I-484
Rabi, Isidor I. I-485
Rabinowitch, Eugene I-486
Randolph, Asa Philip I-487
Rauh, Joseph L. Jr. I-488
Redlich, Norman I-490
Reid, Whitelaw II-523
Reischauer, Edwin I-491
Reston, James I-492
Reuss, Henry I-493
Reuther, Victor I-494
Reuther, Walter I-494
Rhyne, Charles I-495
Ribicoff, Abraham II-523
Riesman, David I-497
Richardson, John Jr. II-525
Roberts, Chalmers I-498

Robeson, Paul II-525
Roche, John P. I-498
Rockefeller, Nelson I-499
Rogge, Oetje John II-529
Romney, George I-504
Roosa, Robert V. II-531
Roosevelt, James I-506
Roper, Elmo I-507
Rose, Alex I-507
Rostow, Eugene V. I-507
Rostow, Walt W. I-508
Roth, William M. II-531
Rovere, Richard I-511
Rowan, Carl I-513
Ruina, Jack P. II-532
Rusk, Dean I-515
Rustin, Bayard I-517
Ryan, Robert II-533
Ryan, William Fitts I-520
Salisbury, Harrison I-521
Saloman, Irving II-534
Samuelson, Paul I-524
Sayre, Francis B. Jr. II-534
Scalapino, Robert A. I-526
Schary, Dore II-535
Schelling, Thomas C. I-528
Schlesinger, Arthur M. Jr. I-529
Schmidt, Adolph W. II-536
Schoenbrun, David I-530
Schuman, Frederick L. I-531
Schurmann, Franz H. II-536
Schwartz, Abba P. I-533
Scott, Hugh I-534
Seale, Bobby II-537
Seeger, Pete I-535
Seligman, Eustace II-543
Senior, Clarence II-544
Seymour, Whitney North I-537

Shapley, Harlow I-539
Shirer, William L. I-540
Shriver, Sargent I-542
Shulman, Marshall II-545
Shuster, George II-546
Smale, Stephen I-543
Smith, Gerald C. II-547
Snow, Edgar I-544
Sockman, Ralph I-545
Sontag, Susan II-548
Sorensen, Theodore I-546
Sparling, Edward J. II-553
Spock, Benjamin I-547
Sproul, Robert G. II-554
Staley, (Alvah) Eugene II-555
Stewart, Maxwell S. I-549
Stone, Isidor F. I-551
Stone, Jeremy J. II-558
Stout, Rex I-553
Strauss, Anna Lord II-559
Streit, Clarence I-554
Struik, Dirk II-560
Stuart, Lyle I-554
Stuber, Stanley I. II-563
Sweezy, Paul M. II-564
Sylvester, Arthur I-555
Symington, Stuart I-558
Szent-Györgyi, Albert I-560
Taylor, Harold II-566
Taylor, Telford I-561
Thomas, Norman I-562
Thompson, Llewellyn I-564
Thurman, Howard II-570
Tippett, Donald Harvey II-570
Trager, Frank N. II-571
Trowbridge, Alexander B. I-564
Tugwell, Rexford Guy I-565
Tydings, Joseph I-567

INDEX OF BIOGRAPHIES

Udall, Morris II-572
Udall, Stewart I-568
Untermeyer, Louis I-569
Urey, Harold C. I-570
Van Doren, Mark II-574
Van Dusen, Henry II-575
Vaughn, Robert II-576
Wadsworth, James J. II-577
Wagner, O(scar) Walter II-578
Walls, William J. II-579
Warburg, Frederick M. II-579
Warren, Earl I-571
Washburn, Abbott II-580
Waskow, Arthur I-575
Watson, Arthur K. II-580
Watson, Thomas J. Jr. I-577
Weaver, Robert I-580
Wechsler, James II-581
Wells, Herman B. II-582
Wheeler, Harvey I-583
Wheeler, Walter H. Jr. II-583
White, Gilbert F. II-583
Wicke, Lloyd II-584
Wieland, William A. I-584
Wiesner, Jerome B. I-588
Wilkins, Roy I-592
Williams, G. Mennen I-595
Williams, Robert F. II-585
Williams, William A. I-596
Wilson, Dagmar I-597
Wirtz, Willard I-601
Worthy, William I-603
Wright, Quincy I-604
Wriston, Henry I-605
Wyzanski, Charles E. Jr. II-591
Yarmolinsky, Adam I-607
Yost, Charles W. II-592
Young, Stephen I-609
Young, Whitney Jr. I-611
Zinn, Howard I-613

(continued from front flap)

The leftist is here in America in greater numbers more secure in his influence, and accelerating his program faster, than ever before. He is found in the AFL-CIO, on the Supreme Court, in the Foreign Policy Association, in the American Assembly, in the National Council of Churches, in Chambers of Commerce, in gubernatorial mansions, on Wall Street, in Congress, in the Anti-Defamation League, in mental health associations, in American Friends of Vietnam, in the Republican and Democrat parties, and marching side-by-side with black powerites, trampling upon others' civil rights and violating law and order. He may deny that he is part of any establishment but his denials will be more heated if he is accused of "rightism." In these biographical sketches, the leftist is presented in his environment.

* * *

Also from Western Islands

THE RED WEB

by Blair Coán

The intriguing story of the successful leftist campaign to smear and discredit Attorney General Harry M. Daugherty and the whole Harding Administration. A shocking exposure of the interlocking leftist activity in Congress, labor unions and professional groups early in the 1920's, this compelling book reveals the Left's methods of destroying their enemies – then and now!

Pocketsize $1.00

WESTERN ISLANDS **Belmont, Mass.**

publishers of
The Americanist Classics